BULLETIN OF
The John Rylands Library
Manchester
EDITED BY THE LIBRARIAN
Published with the aid of the Francis Neilson Fund

VOL. 42 MARCH, 1960 No. 2

NOTES AND NEWS

APART from its collection of medieval jewelled and other bindings containing manuscripts, which are described at length in Dr. M. R. James's *Catalogue of the Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library* (1921), the Library possesses a number of unattached ivories and Limoges enamels from medieval bookcovers. One of the earliest of these, a sixth century ivory, probably of Egyptian or Syrio-Mesopotamian origin, which originally formed the central panel of the front leaf of one such cover, is illustrated as the frontispiece to this number. It was formerly in the Castellani and Crawford Collections.

THE FRONTISPIECE

The panel is divided into two compartments. In the upper, and larger, is depicted the adoration of the Magi, with the Virgin seated in the centre and the Child on her lap. The three Magi, in Persian caps, tunics and long trousers, present their offerings in bowls and an Angel stands in the background. Below is the Nativity with the Virgin reclining, Joseph standing by her side and, flanked by the ox and the ass, the Child in a manger of masonry in front of which the incredulous Salome stretches out her withered hand. The ivory is dark and shows traces of gilding and colouring. The background of the whole panel is patterned with stars and scroll-work.

A descriptive list of the Library's unattached enamels, ivories and book-covers has been compiled and is available for consultation in the Manuscript Department.

LANDOR'S *IMAGINARY CONVERSATIONS*

Landor's *Imaginary Conversations*, of all his works the one he considered most likely to earn him a title to lasting literary fame, was published while he was living in Italy. The manuscript, declined originally by Longmans and other publishers, was committed to Julius Hare (later Archdeacon of Lewes), a classical tutor at Cambridge and younger brother of Landor's intimate friend, Francis Hare. He was entrusted with the task of finding a publisher and given a letter of introduction to Southey, who was to assist him. The choice was an excellent one. It was Hare who persuaded John Taylor of Taylor and Hessey, proprietors of the *London Magazine*, and also, incidentally, the publisher of Keats, De Quincey and Lamb, to undertake the task. It was Hare, too, with the loyal co-operation of Southey, who kept the peace, as far as it could be kept, between Landor and Taylor while the work was being printed.

In June of last year the Library acquired a collection of original correspondence which constitutes a source of primary importance for the publishing history of the *Conversations*. It consists of sixty letters written between March 1823 and November 1828 by Hare, as Landor's agent, to Taylor, with two to Taylor's partner Hessey and one to Southey, drafts of eleven letters (April 1823-April 1825) by Taylor to Hare, Southey and Landor's cousin, Walter Landor of Rugeley, and letters of Walter Landor, all dealing with the negotiations for the publishing of the work, its printing, proof-correcting and reviewing and, not least, the quarrels, sometimes violent, between Landor and his publisher. Hare's task as mediator was a difficult one, for Landor's attitude was characterized by a mixture of carelessness and angry obstinacy while Taylor had strong objections, on personal and other grounds, to printing at all some of Landor's more outspoken comments. One of the most interesting aspects which the letters illustrate is the freedom which Landor permitted Hare and Southey to emend his text. This collection was formerly the property of the Rev. Rashleigh Edward Hungerford Duke, whose mother, Ellen, was Landor's niece.

With the above were also acquired forty-one letters, mainly written from Italy, of Landor himself, which are of value for

their intimate record of his daily life, his self-criticism of his works, and his views on classical and contemporary writers. Six (1811-28) are to his mother, twenty-two (1825-34) to his sisters Elizabeth and Ellen, three (1802-05) to his brother Henry, one (1864) to John Forster, and nine (1805-23) to the Rev. Walter Birch. Birch, a schoolfellow at Rugby, is described by Landor as one of the earliest, wisest and best of his friends, but although Landor's letters to him must have been fairly numerous, apparently thirteen only have survived, according to Tatham, who prints extracts in *The Fortnightly Review*, N.S., Vol. 87; this figure includes the nine mentioned above. In the recently acquired collection is also the letter written to Landor by his brother Robert Eyres Landor in 1812 dissuading him from his plan of becoming a French citizen.

DIBDIN CORRESPONDENCE

The Library already has among its English manuscripts a considerable collection of correspondence and papers of the bibliographer Thomas Frognall Dibdin (1776-1847). Dibdin was closely associated with George John, 2nd Earl Spencer, whose famous Althorp Library was purchased by Mrs. Rylands in 1892. Lord Spencer's acquaintance with Dibdin dated from 1802, in which year the latter began his career as a bibliographer, and from that time a literary correspondence seems to have passed between them for something like thirty years. Lord Spencer became his patron, made him at one time his librarian, and developed the Althorp Library very much under his direction.

In 1812 Dibdin commenced the *Bibliotheca Spenceriana*, a descriptive catalogue of the fifteenth century books which at that time were kept at Spencer House, but were later removed to Althorp. The original manuscript of this work, which was printed in 1814-15, is already in the Library together with six large manuscript volumes, numbering some 800 pages, of his bibliographical and typographical collections. Of his correspondence we possess over 370 letters, of which some 200 (1809-43) were written by him to various correspondents and 172 were addressed to him by Lord Spencer between 1802 and 1816. A further ninety letters written to Dibdin between January 1814

and June 1845 by various correspondents have recently been acquired. They deal almost entirely with bibliographical and literary topics. Among the correspondents are Lord Spencer, the Hon. Robert Curzon, Francis Douce, Hume, William Howley (Bishop of London and, from July 1828, Archbishop of Canterbury), Edward Hawtrey (later Provost of Eton), Macaulay and Dawson Turner. Included is a note of 3 April 1813 from Dibdin to the binder " Mr. Herring " [Charles Hering] respecting " the Spencer Volume " and instructions from him to the printer regarding the *Bibliotheca Spenceriana*.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JOHN STUART MILL

Among other accessions of interest to the Department of Manuscripts may be mentioned the press-copy of John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography*. This manuscript, formerly the property of the grand-daughter of Mill's wife, was sold by order of her executors on 29 March 1922 (Sotheby, Lot 720) and purchased by Messrs. Maggs Bros., from whose possession it apparently passed into private hands. From that time until its re-appearance in a London saleroom in July of last year, where it came to light among a miscellaneous collection of autograph letters and papers, its whereabouts seem to have been unknown. The manuscript is of some importance for the establishing of the text of the *Autobiography*. It has been generally assumed that the original edition of 1873, published in the year of Mill's death under the supervision of his stepdaughter Helen Taylor, was printed from the Columbia University manuscript of the *Autobiography*, the so-called " final " version in Mill's hand. Professor Jack Stillinger of the University of Illinois has, however, recently pointed out that this assumption is incorrect, that the Rylands manuscript forms the basis of the 1873 edition, and that a definitive text of the *Autobiography* would combine the readings of both the Columbia and the Rylands manuscripts.

The latter, which comprises 265 folios is, apart from the first twenty-three, in two hands, each responsible for roughly the same amount. With the generous assistance of the Library of the London School of Economics these hands have been compared with specimens in their Mill-Taylor Collection and identified as

those of Helen Taylor herself and Mary Elizabeth Colman, Mill's sister. In addition, Helen Taylor is responsible for various corrections and emendations throughout the whole. She began the copying but her first twenty-five folios were not used for the press-copy and exist separately (they were also acquired by this Library). They were recopied by an unidentified continental hand, probably French, which compressed their content into the twenty-three folios mentioned above. All the passages omitted from the 1873 edition are in the Rylands manuscript, which is marked for printing throughout and contains the pencilled names of the twenty compositors who set it up.

A detailed comparison of the Columbia University manuscript, the Rylands manuscript and the 1873 edition has been made by Professor Stillinger and an article by him dealing with the text of the final version of the *Autobiography* is to be published in the next issue of this BULLETIN.

RUSKIN LETTERS

A further 380 letters of Ruskin have been added to the Library's collection of Ruskin correspondence and papers, to which reference was made in the previous number (Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 1 ff.). The largest single group consists of 154 letters (1860-89) to Mrs. Anna Oldham and her daughter Constance. Mrs. Oldham was a sister of Edward Oldfield, a schoolfellow and lifelong friend of Ruskin, and their families were neighbours in Denmark Hill. Constance Oldham, an early member of the Guild of St. George, was Ruskin's god-daughter and one of his closest friends during his later years. She acted as an amanuensis for him, copying extracts from books and letters which he afterwards used for his printed works and lectures. One hundred and thirty-eight of the letters recently acquired were addressed to her between 1866 and 1889. Extracts from three only have been printed, by Cook and Wedderburn in *The Works of John Ruskin*; with this minor exception the series is unpublished. The collection is one of great interest, for in it Ruskin expresses freely his views on art, religion and life in general and gives accounts of the progress of his works and of the meaning and purpose of *Fors Clavigera* and *Praeterita*.

Of the remaining letters, fifty-four (1871-88) are to Henry Jowett, the manager of Messrs. Hazell, Watson and Viney's printing works at Aylesbury, and deal with the proof-correcting and printing of various of his works, notably *Proserpina*, *Praeterita* and the monthly *Fors* letters; thirteen, written between 1876 and 1879 to the bookseller and publisher F. S. Ellis and his partner David White, contain information about his purchases of books and his general activities, including the work of the Guild of St. George, for he valued Ellis's opinions highly; and thirty-five (1857-81) are to R. N. Wornum, Keeper of the National Gallery. A number of the last-named date from the period 1857-8 when Ruskin was concerned in arranging the Turner drawings in the National Gallery. Correspondents among the 100 or more miscellaneous letters which remain, dating from the 1840s to the 1880s and dealing with a multiplicity of topics, include Rossetti, G. F. Watts, the architect C. R. Cockerell, the engraver S. Williams, Mrs. (later Lady) Simon, wife of his medical friend (Sir) John Simon, G. Lowes Dickinson, Sir Charles Hallé and E. A. Bond, Librarian of the British Museum, to whom he introduces William Morris. There are, too, six letters to his mother, Margaret Ruskin, written from Winnington Hall, Cheshire, in April 1865. The collection also includes fragments of the original manuscripts of *Praeterita* and of two of his lectures.

The Library's Ruskin correspondence and papers now number more than seventeen hundred items, of which over 1,200 are letters in his hand.

PRINTED BOOKS: ACCESSIONS BY PURCHASE

Among recent additions to the Department of Printed Books are two fifteenth century books. The earlier is a volume ascribed to the press of Christophorus de Pensis at Venice (not before 1495), and consists of Latin translations of *Isocratis Oratio de Laudibus Helenae* and of *Herodoti libri novem* (*BMC.* V, 475, IB. 23533). The translation of Isocrates is by Joannes Petrus Lucensis, that of Herodotus is the work of the celebrated humanist Laurentius Valla. The latter translation, first printed in 1474, was frequently reprinted in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. With an edition of the text, it was reissued as late as 1809.

The impression of de Pensis is a page by page reprint of an edition of the two works printed at Venice, probably by Simon Bevilaqua, which bears the date "1494" but in which the letter of the editor, Antonius Mancinellus, is dated 13 January 1495 (ULC. 2094.5). The Bevilaqua edition, of which also there is a copy in the Library, is, as regards the translation of Herodotus, a reprint, often page by page, of an edition of the historian's work printed by Joannes and Gregorius de Gregoriis at Venice in March 1494 (*BMC.* V, 345, IB. 21058). In a letter prefixed to this edition Mancinellus writes that he had been urged by Gregorius de Gregoriis to undertake a revision of Valla's translation because it had been so much corrupted by earlier Roman and Venetian Printers. In the edition now acquired, as in that of Bevilaqua, the letter is moved to the end of the volume and the name of *Andreas Moretus Brixianus* is substituted for that of *De Gregoriis* as the man to whose initiative the revision is due.

The second acquisition is a copy of the edition of the *Liber sextus decretalium* of Pope Boniface VIII, accompanied by the *Constitutiones* of Pope Clement V, printed at Basel by Johann Froben and Johann Amerbach and bearing the date 1 December 1500 (*GKW.* 4905; *BMC.* III, 793, IA. 37908). The *Liber sextus decretalium* was first printed by Johann Fust and Peter Schoeffer at Mainz, 17 December 1465, and of this edition the Library possesses copies on vellum and on paper. It was a most popular work, fifty-eight editions being printed before the end of the fifteenth century, eighteen of them, commencing with that of De Tortis, Venice, 1491, being accompanied by the *Constitutiones Clementinarum.* Before Froben began to print on his own account in 1491 he had been employed by Amerbach as a corrector of the press. It was not, however, until early in 1500, after a brief partnership with Johann Petri, that Froben joined forces with his old employer. After the turn of the century the partnership was extended by the inclusion of Froben's former partner, Petri, and continued to operate until 1512. In 1500, however, its output was restricted to three works of canon law, all of which were close reprints of editions printed by Froben alone in 1493 and 1494. The woodcut of a Pope giving audience which Froben used in the earlier series reappears in the present

work. The volume, which is in a contemporary binding of stamped pigskin over wooden boards, has two ownership inscriptions of " Petrus de Mean, 1596 ", a distinguished jurist who compiled in 1620, at the direction of Prince Ferdinand of Bavaria, a *Recueil des points marquez pour coustumes du pays de Liege.*

Several interesting additions have been made to the Library's collection of English books printed before 1640. *The summe and substance of . . . the Conference at Hampton Court*, London, John Bill, 1625 (*STC.* 1458), is a work with a certain association with Manchester. William Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, who prepared the account at the request of Archbishop Whitgift, and who took part in the revision of the Epistles for " King James's Bible ", the only lasting result of the Conference, is believed to have been a member of the family of Barlow of Barlow Moor, Manchester. Of the four recorded pre-1640 editions of the book the Library now possesses three, *STC.* 1456, 1458 and 1459, and in addition a variant of the first edition of 1604. Of Pierre Charron, *Of wisdome, translated into English by Samson Lennard*, London, Geo. Miller for W. Ashley, 1630 (*STC.* 5054), four other editions are recorded between 1606 and 1640, none of which is in the Library. Lennard, the translator, was a somewhat unusual person. He served in the Netherlands with Sir Philip Sidney and was with him when he was fatally wounded at Zutphen. Later he took a keen interest in genealogy and was appointed Rouge-rose Pursuivant extraordinary in 1614 and Bluemantle Pursuivant in the following year. His leisure he appears to have devoted to the work of translation from French and Italian. A copy of another of his translations, Jean Paul Perrin's *Luther's forerunners*, 1625 (*STC.* 19769), is also in the Library. A pamphlet much printed in the seventeenth century was Richard Wimbledon's *Sermon . . . preached at Pauls Crosse . . . in the yeare . . . 1388 and found out hidden in a wall . . .*, no less than fifteen editions appearing before 1640. Until the recent acquisition of the fifteenth edition, London, T. Cotes, 1635 (*STC.* 25839), this work was not represented in the Library. Although Gervase Markham's industry in the compilation for the booksellers of books on husbandry and other subjects was such that

he has been described as " the earliest English hackney writer ", few of the early editions of his works are to be found in this Library. A copy of his anonymous work, *The inrichment of the Weald of Kent*, London, A. Griffin for T. Harrison, 1636 (*STC.* 17365), has recently been acquired. As with so many of Markham's works, this book was frequently reprinted, twelve editions appearing before 1700. Translations of only two works by St. Ambrose were printed in this country before 1640. Of the earlier of these, *Twoo bookes of S. Ambrose entytuled : Of the vocation of all nations. Translated by H. Becher*, London, R. Watkins, 1561 (*STC.* 549), the Library acquired a copy some years ago. To it is now added *STC.* 548, *Christian offices crystall glasse, translated by R. Humfrey*, London, for J. Dawson, 1637.

SUTHERLAND TRACTS

An important recent purchase is a collection of forty-five volumes comprising 559 tracts brought together by John Gordon, sixteenth Earl of Sutherland (1660[?]-1733). The majority of them date from the last two decades of the seventeenth and the first decade of the eighteenth centuries, although a few items of earlier date are included. About one-third of the collection consists of polemical works on the religious issues of the day including many tracts by well known divines such as Thomas Case, Rector of Stockport, Samuel Johnson, pilloried and whipped for his attacks on authority, Edward Stephens, known as *Abbat Stephens* on account of his theological learning, and Daniel Featley, a member of the Westminster Assembly.

The bulk of the collection, however, reflects the Earl's interest in the affairs of his time. As in 1689 he took up arms on the Revolutionary side, it is not surprising that there are many anti-Jacobite tracts, among them the anonymous satirical poem *The tribe of Issachar*, 1691 (*W/T* 2270). There are, too, many tracts relating to William III, including a fulsome eulogy by Thomas Plunket, *The character of a good commander*, 1689 (*W/P* 2629).

The earl was an active supporter of the Union of England and Scotland and was, indeed, one of the Commissioners appointed to arrange the terms on which it should take place. As a matter of course, therefore, we find many tracts dealing with the problems

which had to be settled, particularly those of trade and of " the equivalence " of the currency. A rare item of this class is a crudely printed, undated tract, *The Heemble petition of the peer Shank workers and Fingren spinners of Aberdeen*, [n.d.].

Few works of the more important literary figures of the day are represented in the collection and those few appear to gain inclusion by their satirical or political flavour. Examples are John Dryden's *Britannia Rediviva*, re-printed at Holy-Rood-House, 1688 (*W/D* 2252); Robert Gould's *Love given over, or, a satyr against women*, 1686 (*W/G* 1425); the following pamphlet being the anonymous *Sylvia's revenge, or; a satyr against man*, 1688 (*W/S* 6335); and the first edition of Selden's *Table talk*, 1689 (*W/S* 2437). The breadth of the collection may be illustrated by citing one or two pamphlets on scientific subjects as, for instance, George Philips's *Problem concerning the gout, in a letter to Sir John Gordon*, 1691 (*W/P* 2027*B*) and a French translation of Captain Robert Fitzgerald's *Salt water sweetened : L'eau de mer douce . . . Troisieme Edition*, 1684 (*W/F* 1081). The conversion of sea water to fresh water has exercised the mind of man from Aristotle onwards. Great interest was aroused by Fitzgerald's cheap and easy method—he offered a machine of great size for £16, so simple that it could be worked by a sailor and so well built that it would last for years. The pamphlet announcing his invention appeared in 1683 not only in an English edition but in translations into Latin, Spanish and French, and by the following year four editions of the English text and three of the French translation had been required. This collection, brought together by, and reflecting the interests of, a man prominent in the political and social life of the end of the seventeenth century, forms valuable source material for the history of the period and is an important addition to the Library's tract collection.

The following is a list of recent Library Publications, consisting of reprints of articles which appeared in the latest issue of the BULLETIN (September 1959):

RECENT LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS

" Mallarmé on Music and Letters. " By L. J. Austin, Professor of Modern French Literature in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 20. Price three shillings net.

" Manchester in the Latter Half of the Eighteenth Century." By W. H. Chaloner, Senior Lecturer in Modern Economic History in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 21. Price three shillings net.

" The King and the Monks in the Tenth Century Reformation." By Eric John, Lecturer in History in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 27. Price three shillings net.

" Faith and Reason in the Thought of Gregory of Rimini (c. 1300-1358)." By Gordon Leff, Lecturer in History in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 25. Price three shillings net.

" The Jewels of Queen Margaret of Anjou." By A. R. Myers, Reader in Medieval History in the University of Liverpool. 8vo, pp. 19. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

" The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân (IQIsb)." By Bleddyn J. Roberts, Professor of Hebrew, University College of North Wales, Bangor. 8vo, pp. 13. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

" William Catesby, Counsellor to Richard III." By J. S. Roskell, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Nottingham. 8vo, pp. 30. Price three shillings net.

" The Conclusion of Virgil's *Aeneid* : A Study of the War in Latium, with Special Reference to Book XI and XII." By W. H. Semple, Hulme Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 19. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

" Ruskin's Correspondence with Miss Blanche Atkinson." By Margaret E. Spence, Lecturer in the Department of Education in the University of Liverpool. 8vo, pp. 26. Price three shillings net.

" Coptic Biblical Texts Published after Vaschalde's Lists." By Walter C. Till, Reader in Coptic in the University of Manchester ; Tit. Ao. Professor in Egyptology (Vienna). 8vo, pp. 21. Price three shillings net.

" New Plays of Menander." By E. G. Turner, Professor of Papyrology and Director of the Institute of Classical Studies in the University of London. 8vo, pp. 18. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

Since the last issue of the BULLETIN the following donors have made valuable gifts of books to the Library, and to them the Governors offer grateful thanks.

PRINTED BOOKS: GIFTS AND EXCHANGES

Individual Donors

Mr. H. Amir Ali; Mrs. K. M. T. Atkinson; Norman Bates, Esq.; Professor H. Hale Bellot [22]; Mr. Swami Shri Bhagwadacharyaji; Dr. S. A. Birnbaum; The Rev. Principal Matthew Black; Dr. Curt F. Bühler [8]; I. Butterworth, Esq.; Dr. W. H. Chaloner [2]; Dr. R. C. Cobb [7]; O. Ebur, Esq.; W. R. Fletcher, Esq.; S. Giversen, Esq.; Miss Fanny Goldstein; Dr. A. H. Hall; Ronald Hall, Esq.; Mrs. L. Henderson [3]; J. A. Hinks, Esq., O.B.E.; K. W. Humphreys, Esq.; Mrs. Osborne Jones; Professor A. I. Katsh; The Rt. Hon. the Lord Kilmaine; Judge N. Laski [3]; G. Legman, Esq.; Mrs. Melvin D. Morgenstern; Dr. C. E. Pickford; Professor B. R. Rees; Dr. Helen Rosenau; Dr. E. I. J. Rosenthal; The Rev. Professor H. H. Rowley [2]; Professor C. Ryskamp; Roy Sudall, Esq. [5]; Dr. Meir Wallenstein; The Rev. W. H. Thomson; Paul Winter, Esq.; Professor Dr. H. Wolter; J. T. Worrall, Esq. [3]; W. Worthington, Esq., M.B.E.

Institutions

Aberdeen University Library; American Jewish Committee, New York [2]; Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum [2].

Bangalore: Indian Institute of Culture [3]; Basel University Library [8]; Beirut: American University [3]; Berlin: Staatliche Museen [3]; Bethel: Theologische Schule [10]; Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia [2]; Brescia: Ateneo [2]; British and Foreign Bible Society [6]; Trustees of the British Museum; Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie; Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum [2]; Budapest: National Széchényi Library [2]; Buenos Aires University Library; Burns, Oates & Washbourne Limited.

Cairo: Franciscan Centre of Oriental Studies [3]; Canada: High Commissioner in London; Canberra: Commonwealth

Library; Cape Town: National Gallery of South Africa [3]; Librairie R. Clavreuil; Copenhagen: Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab; Copenhagen University Library; Czechoslovak Embassy, London [3].

Darmstadt: Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung [2]; Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft; Dublin: National Library of Ireland [4].

Edinburgh University Library; Erlangen University Library [2].

Foundational Book Company; Friends of Canterbury Cathedral; Friends of the National Libraries.

Gabalda, J., et Cie [3]; Ghent University Library [3]; Gothenburg University Library [2]; Groningen University Library [4].

Hague, The: Koninklijke Bibliotheek; Hamburg: Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek [2]; Harper Brothers; Harvard University Library; Heidelberg University Library; Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica; Helsinki University Library [21].

Ibadan: University College Library; Illinois University Library; Innsbruck University Library; Ismaili Society, Bombay.

Kansas University Library [3]; Keats-Shelley Association; Kentucky University Library [4].

Lancashire Congregational Union; Leningrad: Academy of Sciences [8]; Leopoldville: Lovanium University Library; Liège University Library [2]; Liverpool University Library; Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery; London: Dr. Williams's Library [2]; London: Institute of Classical Studies [2]; London: Institute of Historical Research; London: School of Oriental and African Studies; London: University College Library; London University Library; Louvain University Library [9]; Lund University Library [6].

Madras: Government Museum [3]; Manchester Academy of Fine Arts; Manchester Arts Festival Committee; Manchester: City Art Gallery; Manchester Corporation; Manchester University Library [2]; Manchester University Press [8]; Massachusetts Historical Society [2]; Mendoza University

Library [2]; Minnesota University Library; Montserrat: Abadía: Biblioteca; Munich: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek [2].

National Register of Archives [57]; Editions Nauwelaerts, Louvain.

Paris: American Library; Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale; Pilgrim Trust; Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Limited; Poznan: Poznanskie Towarzystwo Przyjacial Nauk; Pretoria: University of South Africa [5].

Quebec House, Westerham.

Reading University; Richmond, Virginia: Library of the Union Theological Seminary; Robert Watchorn Charities Limited; Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano; Rotterdam: Museum Boymans.

Saar University Library; Samuel H. Kraus Foundation; San Marino: Henry E. Huntington Library; Santo Domingo University Library [4]; Sarajevo: Oriental Institute; Sheffield City Libraries; Sheffield University; Société des Bollandistes; Sotheby & Company Limited; Stanford University Library [4]; Steenbrugge: Sint Pieters Abdij; Stockholm: Kungliga Biblioteket [4]; Strasbourg University Library [3]; Stuttgart: Würtemburgische Landesbibliothek [3].

Toledo University Library.

United States of America: National Archives [12]; Uppsala: Exegetiska Seminariet; Utrecht University Library [3].

Vatican Library; Venice: Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana.

Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk: Komitet Orientalistyczny; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library; Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library; Washington: Library of Congress.

Yale University Library.

THE PARABLES AS ALLEGORY[1]

By MATTHEW BLACK, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.
PRINCIPAL OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

BEFORE the rise of modern Biblical study, it had been customary for centuries to treat the Parables of Jesus as allegories. In this respect they were not interpreted differently from other parts of Scripture, which was uniformly subjected to an allegorizing type of exegesis. But by their very nature, since they themselves conveyed ideas by means of imagery, the Parables inevitably yielded a much richer harvest of theological allegory than other Scriptural passages. Their vivid details were elaborately interpreted, requiring to be " decoded " in theological terms, which meant, in effect, that the Parables became convenient pegs on which the Church could hang most of its theological wardrobe. The stock example is St. Augustine's exposition of the parable of the Good Samaritan :

A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho : Adam himself is meant ; *Jerusalem* is the heavenly city of peace, from whose blessedness Adam fell ; *Jericho* means the moon, and signifies our mortality, because it is born, waxes, wanes and dies. *Thieves* are the devil and his angels. *Who stripped him*, namely, of his immortality ; *and beat him*, by persuading him to sin ; *and left him half-dead*, because in so far as man can understand and know God, he lives, but in so far as he is wasted and oppressed by sin, he is dead ; he is therefore called *half-dead*. The *priest* and *Levite* who saw him and passed by, signify the priesthood and ministry of the Old Testament, which could profit nothing for salvation. *Samaritan* means Guardian, and therefore the Lord Himself is signified by this name. The *binding of the wounds* is the restraint of sin. *Oil* is the comfort of good hope ; *wine* the exhortation to work with fervent spirit. The *beast* is the flesh in which He deigned to come to us. The *being set upon the beast* is belief in the incarnation of Christ. The *inn* is the Church, where travellers are refreshed on their return from pilgrimage to their heavenly country. The *morrow* is after the resurrection of the Lord. The *two pence* are either the two precepts of love, or the promise of this life and of that which is to come. The *innkeeper* is the Apostle (Paul). The supererogatory payment is either his counsel of celibacy, or the fact that he worked with his own hands lest he should be a burden to any of the weaker

[1] A lecture delivered in the Library series of public lectures.

brethren when the Gospel was new, though it was lawful for him "to live by the Gospel".[1]

Exegesis of the Parables of Jesus was not finally rescued from this traditional type of allegorical interpretation until the great work of Adolf Jülicher.[2] Jülicher not only rejected the traditional allegorical method *in toto*; he refused no less to admit the existence in the Gospels of any genuine allegorical parables of Jesus, or, indeed, of any allegorical element in the parables. There was only one case where he was prepared to consider making an exception, the Parable of the Sower (Mark iv. 3 ff., par.), for here the parable and the allegorical interpretation which follows it (verses 14-20) belong closely together: "We have no right to deny it (the allegorical interpretation following the parable) to Jesus, if we regard the story of the Sower, as the Synoptics give it, as His."[3] This would, however, constitute a singular exception to the generally non-allegorical character of the Parables and this favours the view that it is not a genuine parable of Jesus at all, but an allegory of the early Church. One other parable, according to Jülicher, is first and last an allegory, the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mark xii), but this too is not a genuine parable of Jesus, but an early Christian allegory.[4]

Having rejected all allegory Jülicher then sought to explain parables in other terms: each parable was to be understood as the transcript, as it were, of a fragment of real life, and was intended to convey one point or moral, and only one, and this was to be interpreted in as general terms as possible. Thus, the Parable of the Talents simply inculcates fidelity in every trust; the prudent use of present opportunity as the best preparation for a happy future the meaning of the Parable of the Unjust Steward; fear of the ultimate consequences of a life of pleasure of the Rich Man and Lazarus, etc., etc.

Jülicher's definition of parable and his rejection of anything

[1] Quoted from *Quaestiones Evangeliorum*, ii. 19 in the slightly abridged translation of Dr. C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 11 ff.

[2] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, Freiburg i. B., 1886; *zweite neubearbeitete Auflage*, 1899, 1910.

[3] Op. cit. p. 535.

[4] Op. cit. pp. 386, 405 ff.

which might remotely suggest allegory in the parables has dominated their modern interpretation almost as tyrannically as the allegorical method of the earlier centuries. In his important study *The Parables of the Kingdom* Dr. C. H. Dodd accepts the conclusions and method of Jülicher without hesitation and as (more or less) self-evident propositions :

> It was the great merit of Adolf Jülicher, in his work *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (1899-1910), that he applied a thoroughgoing criticism to this method, and showed, not that the allegorical interpretation is in this or that case overdone or fanciful, but that the parables in general do not admit of this method at all, and that the attempts of the evangelists themselves to apply it rest on a misunderstanding (p. 13).

Later Dodd deals with the importance of this view for interpretation :

> This leads us at once to the most important principle of interpretation. The typical parable, whether it be a simple metaphor, or a more elaborate similitude or a full-length story, presents one single point of comparison. The details are not intended to have independent significance. In an allegory, on the other hand, each detail is a separate metaphor, with a significance of its own. Thus in the *Pilgrim's Progress* we have the episode of the House Beautiful. It is a story of the arrival of belated travellers at a hospitable country house. Commentators even undertake to show us the actual house in Bedfordshire. But in the story the maid who opens the door is Discretion, the ladies of the house are Prudence, Piety and Charity, and the bed-chamber is Peace. Or, to take a biblical example, in Paul's allegory of the Christian warrior the girdle is Truth, the breastplate Righteousness, the shoes Peace, the shield Faith, the helmet Salvation, and the sword the Word of God. On the other hand, if we read the parable of the Importunate Friend, it would be obviously absurd to ask who is represented by the friend who arrived from a journey, or the children who are in bed. These and all the other details of the story are there simply to build up the picture of a sudden crisis of need, calling for an urgency which would otherwise be untimely and even impertinent. Similarly in the parable of the Sower the wayside and the birds, the thorns and the stony ground are not, as Mark supposed, cryptograms for persecution, the deceitfulness of riches, and so forth. They are there to conjure up a picture of the vast amount of wasted labour which the farmer must face, and so to bring into relief the satisfaction that the harvest gives, in spite of all (pp. 18 ff.).

The same position is taken by Professor Joachim Jeremias, of Göttingen, who points out, at the same time, that Jewish parables of the New Testament period are sometimes allegorical.[1]

On purely *a priori* grounds there does not seem to be any reason why there should not be allegory in the teaching of Jesus.

[1] *The Parables of Jesus*, London, 1954, p. 16.

Dodd has noted an example from St. Paul. The Old Testament does not know of any distinction between allegory and parable, for the one can easily pass into the other as more than one detail comes to assume a symbolic significance. The Oxford Dictionary also fails to make the distinction, and, in fact, gives " allegory " as one of the meanings of " parable ". Differences are of degree not of kind, and while we must beware of attaching absurd allegorical meanings to details which form no more than the scenic background of a story, we may well be impoverishing our understanding of the parables of Jesus by excluding allegory simply on the basis of the Jülicher canon that the parables are not allegorical. As Dr. Vincent Taylor has written : " The shade of Jülicher must not affright us from admitting allegory when we see it " (*Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 210).

(1) It seems obvious that we must begin with the Parable of the Sower (Mark iv. par.).

In all three Synoptic Gospels the Parable of the Sower is followed by an interpretation addressed to the disciples (Mark iv. 14-20) which understands the parable as pure allegory. That the preceding parable cannot be properly appreciated except as allegory was convincingly argued by Johannes Weiss,[1] and Jülicher was the first to acknowledge the force of Weiss's arguments. The question has remained for the most part undisturbed since this nineteenth-century debate, except for a mildly dissenting protest of Dr. Vincent Taylor in his summary of modern interpretations : " Falling into good ground, the seed is bearing fruit amazingly, thirtyfold, sixtyfold, a hundredfold. This is the main point, but it is not necessary to regard the birds, the thorns, and the rocky ground as simply ' the dramatic machinery of the story '." (*Commentary on St. Mark*, p. 251.)

Modern interpretations of the parable without exception begin with the assumption that the allegorical interpretation, verses 13-20, is a later addition of the Church and not an original part of the parable. Thus C. H. Dodd writes :

[1] According to Weiss (*Die Parabelrede bei Markus*, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 64 (1891) 308 ff.) Jesus told the Parable of the Sower from the start as an allegory : its meaning, however, has not been correctly reproduced in the Marcan interpretation.

. . . this whole passage is strikingly unlike in language and style to the majority of the sayings of Jesus. Its vocabulary includes (within this short space) seven words which are not proper to the rest of the Synoptic record. All seven are characteristic of the vocabulary of Paul, and most of them occur also in other apostolic writers. These facts create at once a presumption that we have here not a part of the primitive tradition of the words of Jesus, but a piece of apostolic teaching.

Further, the interpretation offered is confused. The seed is the Word: yet the crop which comes up is composed of various classes of people. The former interpretation suggests the Greek idea of the "seminal word", while the latter is closely akin to a similitude in the Apocalypse of Ezra: "As the farmer sows over the ground many seeds, and plants a multitude of plants, but in the season not all that have been planted take root, so also of those who have sowed in the world not all shall be saved" (2 Esdras viii. 41). Two inconsistent lines of interpretation have been mixed up. Yet we may suppose that the Teller of the parable knew exactly what He meant by it (pp. 13 ff.).

Interpretation is thus free to concentrate on the parable only and to look for its single point (according to Jülicher's definition). At the same time interpreters nowadays are quite unanimous in rejecting the platitude to which Jülicher himself reduced the parable, viz. that no labour can ever be sure of the same success. Here, however, unanimity ends and no two modern commentators seem to be agreed. Dr. Vincent Taylor lists no less than eight different modern views. The most recent (those of Dodd and Jeremias) concentrate on the symbolism of the phenomenal harvest: it typifies the miraculous coming of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' ministry. Thus Jeremias sums up the parable in one sentence: "In spite of every failure the Kingdom of God is coming at last."[1] The details of the parable, the wayside, the birds, the thorns, the stony ground, are not to be pressed. They are simply there (in C. H. Dodd's words) "to conjure up a picture of the vast amount of wasted labour the farmer must face, and so to bring into relief the satisfaction the farmer feels at the harvest".[2]

To attempt to challenge the view that the attached allegorical

[1] Op. cit. p. 92. 'The abnormal tripling of the harvest's yield (thirty, sixty, a hundredfold) symbolizes the eschatological overflowing of the divine fullness (verse 8). To human eyes much of the labour seems futile and fruitless, resulting apparently in repeated failure, but Jesus is full of joyful confidence; he knows that God has made a beginning, bringing with it a harvest of reward beyond all asking or conceiving. In spite of every failure the Kingdom of God comes at last.'

[2] Op. cit. p. 19.

interpretation is secondary would be a waste of time and effort; it is one of the secure results of modern criticism. But if the interpretation is secondary, the *principle* of interpreting the parable as allegory may be sound. It is from this fresh point of view I want to look at the parable again.

There do not seem to be any valid grounds for questioning the reliability of the Evangelists' reports about the historical situation when the parable was told. It was told in connection with Jesus' highly successful mission in Galilee, when vast crowds gathered about the shore of the Sea of Gennesaret to hang on his words. We are not obliged to assume that the sower is the Teller of the parable (though his hearers may well have done so): it seems more likely that, in the situation in which it was told, the parable of the sower, like the other seed parables in Mark, was intended to portray what the Kingdom of God or its coming in the ministry of Jesus was like. This was its theme according to Mark iv. 11 and this is how Matthew interprets it (xiii. 19). What then is its main point? Is it, as the modern eschatological school now maintains, concentrated solely on the symbolism of the harvest, i.e. the miraculous realization of the Kingdom of God in overflowing divine fullness, now in the ministry of Jesus? There is no need to deny this modern insight: it seems at the same time necessary, however, to recall that the bulk of the parable appears to be describing *not* the miraculous rise of the Kingdom under the symbol of the harvest, but the kind of reception the *mission* of the kingdom got. In that case, the succession of vivid images describing this situation cannot surely be denied significance—the hard roadway where the traffic of men moves and the seed is trampled underfoot or snatched away by the birds of the air (Luke—the latter detail is perhaps an apocalyptic symbol for the Gentile nations), the stony ground where the seed springs up into vigorous life only to wither in the hot sun for lack of depth of earth and moisture, the thorns and weeds that choke the seed, and finally the good soil with its abundant harvest. This is the poetic imagery of oriental poetry and not just the dramatic machinery of the story, told to hearers or for readers steeped in the rich poetic inheritance of the Old Testament; and all poetic imagery is a kind of allegory.

Perhaps the clearest indication that this is not just simple parable is the fact that the crop reaped from the good soil is against all nature ; [1] it is allegory which distorts nature for its own ends (one thinks, e.g., of St. Paul's excursion into the field of horticulture at Romans xi in his remarkable allegory of the wild olive).[2]

It seems to me that for a much sounder exegesis as a whole we have to go back to the older liberal tradition of this country which, while taking account of the Jülicher position, held firmly to the dictates of plain exegetical common sense. Typical of these is Professor Alan Menzies's treatment in his book *The Earliest Gospel.* The story arose out of Jesus' experience as a preacher.

> He too has met with obstacles and feels that much of his preaching has been thrown away. Does he mean us to find in his work a species of failure answering to each of the failures of the sower? Has his word fallen on hard places where it never could enter at all, and the birds of the air, in this case invisible, caught it away before it was ever thought of? Has his preaching fallen on shallow soil where it was welcomed at first but could not strike root? Has he also felt that he has made converts only to find soon after that the hearts he thought he had impressed were too much engrossed with worldly cares and struggles to belong to him permanently? Perhaps he meant us to think of these details, perhaps not (p.107).

The parable closes with the words " He that hath ears to hear let him hear " (verse 9). Whether these words were original to the parable is a debated question. But " he that hath ears to hear " will still hear other words in the parable besides " And some fell on the good ground, and bore fruit as it mounted up and increased, and yielded as much as thirty and sixty and a hundredfold."

(2) That the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mark xii. 1-11, par.) is pure allegory not even Jülicher attempted to deny. As Jesus' parables, however, were not, in his opinion, allegorical,

[1] Cf. Jeremias, op. cit. p. 22, n. 7. A good harvest might show a tenfold return (sevenfold appears to have been normal), but thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and a hundredfold would be a sheer miracle. Cf. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina,* iii. 153 ff.

[2] St. Paul's ideas for the grafting of the branches of the wild-olive with the old cultivated olive are described by C. H. Dodd as " a truly remarkable horticultural experiment " (*Commentary on Romans,* xi. 17). The details serve, of course, the purpose of the allegory.

the parable must have been constructed by the early church with the death of Jesus in mind. A quite opposite view is taken by modern exegetes: the story in its most primitive form is pure parable without any allegorical features and is a genuine parable of Jesus. We do not, however, have this primitive form in any of the Gospels, all of which have allegorized the parable. Thus Jeremias writes:

> A further example of allegorical interpretation is the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. This parable, linked up as it is with the Song of the Vineyard in Isa. v. 1-7, exhibits an allegorical character which is unique among the parables of Jesus. The vineyard is clearly Israel, the tenants are Israel's rulers and leaders, the owner of the vineyard is God, the messengers are the prophets, the son is Christ, the punishment of the husbandmen symbolizes the ruin of Israel, the "other people" (Matt. xxi. 43) are the Gentile Church. The whole parable is evidently pure allegory. Nevertheless this impression undergoes radical modification when the different versions are compared. (1) First of all it is to be observed that in Luke xx. 10-12 the sending of the servants retains the features of a simple story: a servant is sent three years in succession; the first is soundly beaten, the second is both beaten up and insulted, the third is wounded. Nothing here suggests a deeper allegorical meaning . . . the evidence of Mark confirms the fact that the decisive feature of Luke's version, namely, the thrice-repeated sending out of a single servant and his dismissal empty-handed, is the original form of the parable, since in Mark also (xii. 2-5) we find the account of the thrice-repeated sending out of a single servant. Nevertheless, by adding verse 5b the Marcan form has abandoned the popular triple formula, since there follows a summary account of a multitude of servants, some of whom are beaten and some killed. It cannot be doubted that we have here a reference to the prophets and their fate. This allegory, obscuring the original picture, can hardly be other than an expansion.[1]

The original parable was a parable of judgement, of impending doom against the tenants of the vineyard, the rulers and leaders of Israel. Jeremias thinks that it was the Temple authorities, the priestly members of the Sanhedrin, to whom the parable's terrible threat refers: "God, who has waited with such inconceivable patience, is now about to demand his dues, and the last generation must expiate the accumulated guilt." [2]

It seems fairly obvious that Luke has preserved a version of the parable independent of Mark (though not necessarily uninfluenced at several points by the Marcan version); there are also indications that the Lucan parable goes back to a Greek prototype (L or Q?), in some respects more primitive than Mark's (Luke

[1] Op. cit. pp. 55 ff. [2] Op. cit. p. 124.

retains, e.g. one notable semitism that has disappeared in Mark[1]). As Jeremias rightly remarks, it is in Luke a simple tale which has been complicated, not to say confounded, first by the Marcan, then by the Matthaean tendency to allegorize its details.

Particularly noteworthy of the Lucan parable—and the point may be important for its interpretation—is that the Lucan story builds up gradually to a dramatic climax: the first servant is beaten up and sent away empty-handed (verse 10, *οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δείραντες κενόν*); with the second, insult is added to injury (*οἱ δὲ κἀκεῖνον δείραντες καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξαπέστειλαν κενόν*);[2] the third servant is not only beaten up, but wounded and forcibly ejected from the vineyard (*οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τραυματίσαντες ἐξέβαλον*). The climax of rebellion and iniquity of the tenants is reached when the owner's only son[3] is also violently thrown out or ejected from the vineyard, but he only (according to Luke) is murdered. (*καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἀπέκτειναν*).[4]

Here we have a gripping tale dramatically told, built up to a tragic climax and no doubt true to the life of the time. But is

[1] The twice repeated *προσέθετο* at verses 11 and 12 which may be a Lucan "biblicism", but could equally well come from an original Aramaic.

[2] Here Mark (xii. 4) may preserve a very primitive translation-Greek text in his curious *ἐκεφαλίωσαν*, "struck him on the head" (?). This verb is a notorious crux (see Taylor, *Comm., in loc.*). The meaning usually favoured (though nowhere else attested) is "to wound or knock on the head", since it is some such meaning which the context requires. More than once it has been conjectured that "something in the original Aramaic suggested it" (Allen, *Mark, ad loc., J.T.S.*, ii. 298 ff.).

It is tempting to conjecture that the original word was *meraṭ* (or in the intensive Palel *marṭeṭ*): the word, common in Aramaic, is also a Hebrew one, meaning "to make smooth, bare, bald", and idiomatically of "making bare" the cheek or head by plucking out the hair or beard; cf. Isa. l. 6, Neh. xiii. 25 (both acts of violence). (A synonymous expression is *gerah*; cf. Arab, *qaraha*, to injure.) Such treatment, the plucking out of the hair and beard, was considered to be the worst form of insult and of humiliation. (For a Greek parallel, cf. Herodotus, ii. 121.) It also involved personal injury to the head, and this may be what suggested the Marcan *ἐκεφαλίωσαν*. Note that it is associated with dishonour and disgrace (*καὶ ἠτίμασαν*.) (An alternative to Burkitt's conjecture, *ἐκολάφισαν*, would be to read *ἐφαλάκρωσαν*. Cf. Ezek. xxvii. 31.)

[3] Cf. Taylor, *in loc.*

[4] According to Mark xii. 5, the third servant is killed; Matthew (xxi. 35) kills off the servants from the start.

this gradually unfolding drama of Luke, told not with a popular " triple formula " only but with a more effective " three plus one " formula, necessarily without any underlying significance? It is this 3 + 1 formula which is the decisive feature of the Lucan parable. Can it really be said that there is nothing in it that suggests a deeper allegorical meaning? Time and again—the parable appears to be teaching—and each time worse than the last—Israel's leaders have rejected the emissaries of the lord of the vineyard. Is this not, in fact, a vivid tale designed to portray the crescendo of rebelliousness and wickedness of the rulers of Israel now reached, after a long history of similar crimes, in the ministry of Jesus? If so, then this graphically presented climax of iniquity must be no less symbolic than the figure of the vineyard for Israel and of the husbandmen for her rulers. In that case it seems unnatural and illogical to deny a meaning to the remaining two " details ", the " servants " and the only son; the former can only refer to the prophets whom the leaders of Isreal had repeatedly rejected.[1]

Mark and Matthew have undoubtedly taken liberties with the simple Lucan story in the interests of allegory; but they are not turning the story from parable into allegory; they are simply heightening and elaborating the effects in what was originally an allegorical tale.

The failure to recognize it as such and attempts to explain it as " pure parable " have left a curious gap in the interpretation of the parable. We are told about the crimes of the wicked husbandmen, and about their impending doom, but *nothing, on this interpretation of the parable, about those against whom these crimes were committed.*

This gap is filled in by Dr. Dodd who writes (italics mine):

> The parable therefore stands on its own feet as a dramatic story, inviting a judgment from the hearers, and the application of the judgment is clear enough without any allegorizing of the details. Nevertheless, the climax of iniquity in the story suggests a similar climax in the situation to which it is applied. We know that Jesus did regard His own ministry as the culmination of God's dealings with His people . . . Consequently the parable would suggest, by a kind of tragic irony, the impending climax of the rebellion of Israel *in a murderous assault upon*

[1] *Δοῦλος* [*θεοῦ κυρίου*] is applied to the prophets from Amos onwards (cf. Sanday and Headlam on Rom. i. 1): Amos iii. 7, Jer. vii. 25, Dan. ix. 6(*Θ*).

the Successor of the prophets. If now we concede that Mark has placed the parable in its true historical context (and in the Passion-narrative, to which this part of the Gospel is an introduction, the sequence of events is more clearly marked, and probably more true to fact, than we can assume it to be elsewhere), then the situation was one in which the veiled allusions might well be caught by many of the hearers. Jesus had, in the Triumphal Entry and the Cleansing of the Temple, challenged the public of Jerusalem to recognize the more-than-prophetic character of His mission. The parable might be understood as enforcing that challenge: "*O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets . . .*" . ."—what will the next step be? This is not allegory. It is a legitimate use of parable to bring out the full meaning of the situation.[1]

While thus showing allegory firmly to the door, one cannot but wonder if Dr. Dodd has not surreptitiously smuggled it in again by the window. For his exposition retains all the essential features of the Gospel allegory which both he and Jeremias reject: the vineyard is Israel; the tenants of the vineyard guilty of such terrible crimes are the rulers and leaders of Israel; a fearful doom is threatened for them for their crimes. But against whom were their crimes committed? "The parable", Dr. Dodd says, "might be understood as reinforcing Jesus' challenge to recognize the more than prophetic character of His mission: 'O Jerusalem that killest the prophets. . . .'" Their crimes are, in other words, against God's servants the prophets and his beloved Son whom the crowds have just been hailing in the Triumphal Entry as Son of David. Dodd manages to get the benefit of allegory while denying that it is allegory—to run with the allegorical hare, as it were, and still hunt with the Jülicher hounds. This will not do. The straightforward answer is that the parable was first and last an allegory and that its main characters are to be understood allegorically.

The recognition that the Jülicher canon is a much too pedantic and mechanical rule of thumb to apply to the lively oracles and the living words of Jesus, encourages one to look further into this problem, and I turn now to two of the greatest of the parables, the Parable of the prodigal son and of the good Samaritan. Here again, it seems to me, it is the category of allegory rather than parable that helps us most in our attempt to understand them.

(3) The parable of the prodigal son, or, as we may prefer to describe it, the parable of the merciful father and the two sons,

[1] Op. cit. pp. 130 ff.

is found in Luke only (xv. 11-32). It is introduced by the words, " Now there were approaching him all the publicans and sinners to hear him, and the Pharisees and scribes were complaining ' This fellow is receiving sinners and consorting with them at table '. Therefore he told them this parable." [1]

" The Lucan setting is surely so far right", Dr. C. H. Dodd writes, " that (these) parables refer to the extravagant concern (as it seemed to some) which Jesus displayed for the depressed classes of the Jewish community " (p. 120). It is not difficult with our knowledge of this situation to see in the lost son a symbol of those depressed classes, the publicans and sinners, who crowded to hear him. Nor does it seem likely that the Pharisees and scribes would have any difficulty in discerning who was meant by the elder brother. The *Sitz im Leben* of the parable, that is, assists us in understanding the symbolism of the two sons. What of the identity of the father in the parable? In his recent exposition Dr. Jeremias begins by telling us that the parable might more correctly be described as the Parable of the Father's Love, since the father, not the returning son, is the central figure. In this he is surely right and most students of the parable will endorse his conclusion that " The parable describes with touching simplicity what God is like, his goodness, his grace, his boundless mercy, his abounding love " (op. cit. p. 105): yet he insists, " The parable is not an allegory, but a story drawn from life . . the father is not God but an earthly father; yet some of the expressions used are meant to reveal that in his love he is an image of God " (p. 103). It is true the father in the story is not God, yet if he is portrayed as the image of God it seems simplest to regard this central feature of the story as intended to portray the love of God as that of a merciful father—and this is surely as close to allegory as makes no difference.

The twin parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin are both directed to the same point and the fact that in the story of the lost coin the central figure is that of the distraught housewife

[1] What in fact follows are the three Lucan parables of the lost sheep, lost coin and two sons, but the twin parable of the lost coin and lost sheep is probably a Lucan insertion, the singular *τὴν παραβόλην ταύτην* referring originally only to the third parable.

prevents us from allotting any symbolic significance to this feature. Yet, as Dodd himself admits, there is a suggestion of allegory in the parable of the lost sheep; the home-keeping sheep are the righteous, the strayed sheep the sinner, the strayed sheep found the repentant sinner. Moreover, "the hearers of the first parable could hardly fail to be reminded of the familiar Old Testament allegory of Jehovah and his flock" (op. cit. p. 119, n.). The border line between parable and allegory is a very narrow one.

(4) The Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x. 29-37), told in response to a question asked by "a certain lawyer" (at the close of an interview in which he had come enquiring about "eternal life" (25-8)), does not fit very well into its Lucan context.

The lawyer's question "Who is my neighbour?" is not one which is given any clear or logical answer in the parable. The reason for this almost certainly is, as scholars have widely recognized, that the connection of the incident with the parable is entirely artificial; as with all the six Lucan Parables in chapters x-xix, the Parable has been supplied by Luke with a context in the ministry of Jesus. It is best in this case to forget altogether the Lucan context for the parable, and to look for the meaning of the story, its *raison d'être*, within the parable itself.

It has been suggested more than once that the story was originally told, not of a Samaritan, but of a good "Israelite", i.e. a Jewish layman to contrast with the Temple priest and Levite. But to turn the central figure of the parable, the good Samaritan, in this way into another Jew, and a co-religionist of the man who fell among thieves, clearly a Jew going from Jerusalem to Jericho, is surely to rob the parable of its main—if not its only—point. The truly remarkable element in this unforgettable story is that it is a Samaritan, an avowed and bitter enemy of the Jewish people, who is found rendering such an unheard of act of mercy and humanity to a Jew. It is like the act—even stranger in its Old Testament context—narrated at 2 Chron. xxviii. 5 ff.: a large band of Ephraimites, the ancestors of the Samaritans, in response to a word of the Lord from the prophet Oded, not only spare the lives of Judaean captives taken

in a large and successful raid on Jerusalem but show them mercy and humanity by clothing and caring for them and restoring them to their brethren in Jericho: "And the men (the Ephraimite leaders) . . . took the captives, and with the spoil clothed all that were naked amongst them, and arrayed them and shod them, and gave them to eat and to drink, and anointed them and carried all the feeble of them upon asses, and brought them to Jericho, the city of palm trees, to their brethren: then they returned to Samaria." It seems impossible to deny that we have in this story one of the sources of inspiration of the parable—and a clue to its main point, the unexpected, indeed one might also say totally unnatural conduct of the Ephraimites at 2 Chron. and their descendant the Samaritan at Luke x. 29 ff.

Since there seems to be little doubt that we are dealing with a genuine parable of Jesus, it is natural to go on to ask, To what part of the teaching of Jesus could such a story belong? Is there any obvious *Sitz im Leben* in the ministry of Jesus? In general, if the main point of the parable be the extraordinary act of humanity of the Samaritan, then it fits most naturally into Christ's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount on *Love of Enemies*, and might be regarded as a concrete illustration of that teaching. It is probably idle to speculate about any one particular place or context in the Gospels, but it is perhaps worth noting how appropriately the story would come after the Lucan version of the teaching on *Love of Enemies* at Luke vi. 27 ff. The Good Samaritan is showing a compassion such as God Himself has shown (vi. 35, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους): he is fulfilling the threefold injunction of verses 33-5 of love to enemies, doing good to those that hate us and lending without hope of return; the good Samaritan had compassion on his traditional enemy (verse 33, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη); he did good to him (verse 34) and he lent without any security or possible hope of return (verse 35).

If this is how the parable is to be understood in general, then it furnishes a close parallel to the Parable of the merciful father and the two sons in so far as it is a story which assumes a familiar historical situation—the ancient feud between Jew and Samaritan. The Jerusalem priest and Levite are representative of the

Sadducaean class, the bitterest enemies of the Samaritans (the feud was fundamentally a religious quarrel about priestly succession). The fact that their representatives, the priest and Levite, leave a fellow-Jew to die, brings into sharper relief the extraordinary act of the Samaritan to his traditional enemy. The parable not only illustrates Christ's teaching about love to enemies: it does so by scoring a point against the (well known) inhumanity of the Sadducees. It is, indeed, even possible that the parable was originally addressed to Sadducees and was one of the ways in which they were silenced (Matt. xxii. 34).[1] In other words, the story is holding up a mirror to a real situation familiar to all its hearers. But it is not a simple parable; it is much more of the nature of allegory.

What conclusion are we to draw from this discussion? It seems to me that the most sensible word on the subject was said by A. H. McNeile:

"When more than one truth is illustrated (in a parable) the picture approaches an allegory, and it is not always certain which details are intended to illustrate something, and which are merely part of the scenic framework. The tendency to allegorize every detail, seen notably in Philo, but also in Christian writers, e.g. Origen and Hilary, often led to strained, and even grotesque methods of interpretation. . . . The best modern exegesis avoids it. But the opposite extreme must also be guarded against, i.e. the refusal to admit that more than a single point can be illustrated in a parable, as, for example, by Jülicher. . . . The principal object in the foreground of a picture is not the only object visible. Jewish utterances must be judged by Jewish not Greek rules of rhetoric . . . Parables differ widely in their nature and will not come under a single rule. And although the admission of this leads to differences of opinion in some cases, the gain exceeds the loss; flexibility of treatment is psychologically safer than rigidity in dealing with language so ζῶν καὶ ἐνεργής as that of the Lord's parables" (*The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, p. 186).

[1] The lawyer who wishes "to justify himself" reminds us of Luke xvi. 15, οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτούς, identified by Luke as Pharisees, but, more probably, for a group so described, Sadducees (cf. T. W. Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 295). Cf. further 1 Enoch (Greek) 102. 10, ἴδετε οὖν, οἱ δικαιοῦντες[ἑαυτ]ούς; *Ass. Mos.* vii. 3 and the note of R. H. Charles, *in loc.* "et regnabunt de his homines pestilentiosi et impii, dicentes se esse iustos"—they were Sadducees; Ephraim (ed. Moesinger, p. 288): "Saducaei diebus Ioannis inchoarunt, velut iustes a populo se separantes et resurrectionem mortuorum negantes . . ."; Ps. Clem. *Recog.* i. 54. This popular explanation of the name was evidently well-known to the Christian Fathers.

CONSTANTINE, ROME AND THE RABBIS

By The Rev. ARNOLD EHRHARDT, Dr. jur., B.D., Ph.D.
BISHOP FRASER LECTURER IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

I

THE sources for a true appreciation of the man who by his conversion to Christianity opened the door to the conversion of the nations of the earth are lamentably inadequate. The recent attempt made by H. Dörries [1] to curtail them still further by separating legal and other pronouncements issued under Constantine's name as his " self-testimony ", and to base upon them an account of his character and work, has, however, one might almost say, fortunately, miscarried. For from a general point of view it seems already inadvisable to rely too much upon such self-testimonies of historical figures of the past. Neither Julius Caesar nor Augustus, neither Frederick the Great nor Catherine the Great, nor any other statesman will be fairly judged if their memoirs, their letters, philosophical essays or political pronouncements are chosen for a starting point of their historical appreciation. Of Constantine in particular I have tried to show that a number of his laws were issued even without his knowledge, and should not be treated as characteristic for his religious policy.[2] In a somewhat wider setting I have also endeavoured to prove that none of the Constantinian laws in the Theodosian Code has been preserved in its original form.[3] They all without exception are *regesta* of his laws, compiled by a chancellery the members of which were not unanimously in favour of their Emperor's religious policy. The sum total of sources containing a self-testimony of Constantine is thus considerably reduced. It

[1] H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins, Abhandlungen der wiss. Ges. Göttingen*, 3, Folge 34 (1954).

[2] " Some aspects of Constantine's legislation", *Studia Patristica*, II, T.U., lxiv (1957), 114 f.

[3] " Constantin d. Gr. Religionspolitik und Gesetzgebung", *Sav. Z. rom.*, lxxii (1955), 27 f.

may also be asked how far the vindication of Constantine's religious edict in Eusebius, *Vita Const.* ii. 26 f., by A. H. M. Jones and T. C. Skeat [1] may not cover changes in the redaction of this and similar documents. The primary source at any rate for the historical appreciation of the great figures of the past should always be the impression made by them upon the people amongst whom they lived.

From this point of view it is to be regretted that the continued interest in Constantine and his period has side-stepped that document which for more than a millennium was regarded as the authoritative appreciation of the great Emperor in the West, and highly respected even by Byzantine and other Eastern historians, the so-called *Actus Sylvestri.* There exist literally hundreds of manuscripts of this remarkable document, but none of them has been printed in recent time.[2] W. Levison [3] has made a comprehensive study of the evidence, which should serve as a starting point for any future research ; but it is not, and could not have been final in any sense of the word, and it is much to be regretted that he did not produce an edition, probably because rather than in spite of his knowledge of the manuscript evidence. I intend to do no more here than to assess the possible gain for our knowledge of Constantine which may be reaped from a critical perusal of the *Actus Sylvestri* ; and for this purpose I have chosen the very telling, and equally enigmatic, scene of Sylvester's dialogue with the Rabbis.

II

Since, unfortunately, familiarity with the *Actus Sylvestri* cannot be presupposed in this our present generation, certain data have to be established before entering upon our actual task. The *Actus Sylvestri,* alas, were so popular in medieval times that it is difficult to arrive at an authoritative text. Since the end of the fifth century they circulated in two distinct forms, A and B. A, the longer version in two books, was predominantly used in

[1] *J.E.H.* (1954), pp. 196 f.

[2] I have used the edition of Boninus Mombritius, *Vitae Sanctorum,* ii (1480), 278 f., and compared it with that by Lipomanus-Surius, *De vitis Sanctorum* (1581), vi. 337 f.

[3] *Miscellanea Ehrle,* ii (1924), 159 f.

the West, whilst B, the shorter version, not divided into books, entered the Greek-speaking world. Originally both versions were in Latin, for Mgr. Duchesne's hypothesis of a Greek original became untenable when the true date of the Armenian historian Moses of Chorene had been discovered as being only the eighth century. For thus it was made possible to maintain that he had used no more than a Greek translation of the B version, and not the Greek original of *Actus Sylvestri*. However, the high antiquity of Greek interest in the *Actus Sylvestri* is shown by the fact that the Latin tradition in both A and B versions has preserved the Greek name for mount Soracte as " Sirapti " in practically all manuscripts as well as in the two medieval German epics containing the story of Pope Sylvester.[1] Another important witness for the impact made by the B version upon Byzance is the historian Georgius Cedrenus, who exhibited this version, almost in its entirety, in his history of the world, written at the end of the eleventh century ;[2] and more of them could be mentioned.

W. Levison has claimed that both these versions, A and B, were produced successively by the same author ; but this I find hard to believe. For the B version exhibits theological formulae which are clearly post-Chalcedon, and which are missing from A, thus showing that it is the later form of *Actus Sylvestri*. At the same time B has a more rational distribution of the subject matter, which I would prefer to ascribe to the author of the Sylvester legend, and marked differences in the disputation of Sylvester with the Rabbis, the authority of which deserves a careful examination. The fact that B is the later version is also emphasized by textual evidence. For B assigns the position of arbitrator in the contest between Sylvester and the Rabbis to the Emperor Constantine, but its wording shows in one or two instances a clear dependence upon an earlier version where several arbitrators are appointed, as is the case in A.[3] It is, however, difficult to assume that B was a mere improvement upon A, for it has been shown by Vacher Burch[4] that it is the B version—in the form preserved by Georgius Cedrenus—where

[1] Cf. Vacher Burch, *Myth and Constantine the Great* (1927), pp. 30 f.
[2] *Georg. Cedrenus*, ed. Imm. Bekker (1838), pp. 475 f., 478 f.
[3] W. Levison, op. cit. p. 198.
[4] V. Burch, op. cit. pp. 166 f.

the disputation with the Rabbis shows clear signs of dependence upon Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, IV, an earlier author than Arnobius minor, the author to whom, according to Levison,[1] the dialogue in the A version is indebted. Consequently we are compelled to conclude that the B version was not derived from A, but from an earlier archetype ; and whilst we cannot treat its Chalcedonian formulae as genuine, we should accept its dialogue of Sylvester and the Rabbis in substance, and admit the possibility that its sequence of events represents the author's intentions better than A. Moreover, being forced to admit that A is pre-Chalcedon, we will have to assess the date of the common archetype for A and B not later than the early years of the fifth century.

This result is of very great importance in that it strengthens Levison's thesis [2] that the author of *Actus Sylvestri* must have been aware of his violation of historical truth when he claimed that Sylvester had cleansed Constantine from his leprosy and had baptized him. It also increases the probability, which in any case is considerable, that the introduction of *Actus Sylvestri*, beginning " historiographus noster Eusebius ", although it varies significantly in A and B and is missing from several manuscripts, is nevertheless genuine. For the date suggested for the archetype places the author of the *Actus* in the neighbourhood of Rufinus, the translator of Eusebius. The two also appear as related to each other in another respect : Rufinus's deviations from the truth are notorious, at least in so far as his translations from Origen are concerned. By and large, therefore, it is safe to claim that the *Actus Sylvestri* are a conscious fake ; and it thus becomes difficult to subscribe to Levison's thesis that the legend was produced simply for the purpose of edification.

Our reserve towards the document increases still more when we see how partial the Roman Church showed itself towards the *Actus Sylvestri* already by the end of the fifth century. Not only did it exhibit the fount in which Constantine was said to have been baptized[3] and make reference to the *Actus* in its official account of the life of Pope Sylvester I ; [4] not only did it approve of them

[1] Op. cit. pp. 202 f.
[2] W. Levison, op. cit. p. 186.
[3] *Liber Pontificalis* I, ed. Duchesne (1884), p. 174.
[4] Ibid. p. 170.

being read in churches in Italy and elsewhere by the *decretum Gelasianum*,[1] but it is quite evident that the so-called *constitutio Sylvestri*, a forgery of the time of Pope Symmachus (498-514), is under great obligation to the *Actus*, as Levison himself has shown. It is also *publici iuris* that our document has lent its glamour to later forgeries as well, in particular Ps. Isidorus : *similia similibus*. The *Actus Sylvestri* should therefore be regarded as a tainted source. How much so, and with what purpose tainted, can be finally assessed only when the whole body of hagiographical literature which issued from Rome in the time roughly between the years 400 and 470 is taken into account. For we are here faced with the question : What was the purpose of this sudden activity at Rome during that time, in a Church not renowned so far for its fertility in the production of highly imaginative legendry ?

Once more the name of Rufinus has to be mentioned in this connection as the author of the " History of the monks in Egypt",[2] in order to show that the special hagiographical interest was very much alive in the circles to whom the introduction " historiographus noster Eusebius " points ; and the figure of Pope Damasus, the patron of Rufinus, may loom in the background, to make it understandable which conception of the papacy inspired the inventor of the Sylvester legend. For if the date suggested for the archetype of *Actus Sylvestri* is correct, this fabrication is the earliest piece in this group of Roman legends, and should set the standard for the assessment of its successors. For it is also the piece which became most influential, perhaps the most influential of all the legends in the calendar, and this for one very evident reason : it outlines the ideal relation between the model Pope and the ideal Emperor, and—to my mind—cannot be divested of a political purpose, closely related to that of Augustine's *Civitas Dei*. The famous question of Augustine, " remota enim iustitia quid sunt regna nisi magna latrocinia ",[3] seems to

[1] Decr. Gelas. 18, ed. E. Preuschen, *Analecta* (1893), p. 151. The *decretum*, as we have it, probably belongs to Gaul rather than Italy, cf. W. Schneemelcher in E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 3rd edn. (1959), i. 21 f., but " it reflects Roman tradition", and this clause is evidently Roman.

[2] Ed. by E. Preuschen, *Palladius und Rufinus* (1897).

[3] Augustine, *Civ.*, IV. 4.—Constantine's speech is found in Boninus Mombritius II, 280, b 8 f.

be the leading thought in Constantine's speech on the " pietas imperii Romani " in *Actus Sylvestri*, by which he rejects the plan of the "pontifices Capitolii" to cure his leprosy by means of a bath in the blood of innocent children, and sends home the mothers with their children. At the beginning of the fifth century the question of the relation between Church and State was indeed a burning one, and in the West it could be freely discussed because the power of the Emperor was weakened so much in the days of Honorius.

The weakness of the imperial administration, however, had not impaired the almost unlimited respect for the institutional imperial majesty and, if we consider the content of *Actus Sylvestri* in this light, it becomes clear that it was the intention of the author to outline in them that at the beginning (remember that St. Sylvester's day is 31 December) an ideal relationship between the model bishop of Rome, Sylvester, and the founder of the Christian Roman Empire was inaugurated; and for this he claimed strongly that the Pope should be the " spiritual arm " in the imperial administration. This claim was also made in answer to a burning question. For under the pagan Emperors the Church had traditionally referred the saying of Christ, " be not afraid of them which kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do " (Luke xii. 5; Matt. x. 28) to the imperial government, and had characterized the Emperor as the ruler over the body only.[1] Constantine, with his characteristic quick appreciation of a tangled situation, had countered this by his claim to be regarded as " the bishop of those outside ". However, the Church may have been ready to recognize Constantine's apostleship,[2] but it would not—and could not—endow each and every Emperor with the episcopate. A new situation had arisen, in which the traditional formula: The body for the Emperor, the soul for God, was no longer applicable, but where the Christian Emperor's claim to rule over both the body and the soul had to

[1] Cf. our *Politische Metaphysik*, ii (1959), 254 f.

[2] In some forms of the A version, e.g. in Surius, " scales " are said to have fallen from Constantine's body when he was cleansed of his leprosy. Although this may be consistent with the disease, it may also have been stated to emphasize the similarity with St. Paul, at whose baptism " scales " fell from his eyes, Acts ix. 8.

be most strenuously resisted. It is not without significance for the appreciation of *Actus Sylvestri* that the nearest approach to " Caesaro-Papalism " was reached under the reign of Theodosius the Great.[1]

III

When seen from this angle the story told us in *Actus Sylvestri*, which we will now rehearse shortly, assumes a special poignancy. It begins with the youth of the Saint, outlining that he was hospitable, as befits a bishop (1 Tim. iii. 2), and already as a layman defied the anti-Christian authority of the pagan state and set at naught its representative, the city-prefect Tarquinius.[2] Sylvester is also described as the son of a widow, Justina, a feature which once more reminds us of Timothy ;[3] and this parallel is further enhanced by the fact that the Egyptian martyr to whom Sylvester extends his hospitality is called Timotheus. When Sylvester has been freed from his chains by the unexpected death of his persecutor, Tarquinius, which he however had prophesied, Pope Melchiades ordains him presbyter, for as a confessor Sylvester is spared the tedious progress through the lower clerical grades.[4] Shortly afterwards, at the death of Pope Melchiades, clergy and laity together unanimously (perhaps again an allusion to Pope Damasus and his hotly contested election) elect Sylvester as his successor. In this position he not only foregoes the

[1] Cf. S. Greenslade, *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius* (1954), pp. 31 f., and the paper read by W. Ensslin at the Tenth Congress of Byzantine Studies, Salonika, 1953.

[2] W. Levison, op. cit. p. 183, makes much of the " gentilicium Perpenna", which he has found in a " praefectus urbi " of ± 440, and thus gets himself into serious trouble with regard to the date of *Actus Sylvestri*. However, the " gentilicium ", which is missing from B, is indicative only for the time of origin of the A version, but not of the archetype.

[3] Sylvester's father's name in the *Liber Pontificalis* is Rufinus. This is perhaps derived from other Roman traditions about him ; but it is tempting to assume the intellectual father of the legend may have left his mark here. Levison, op. cit., 183 is probably right in identifying the Timotheus in the Actus with the Roman martyr of A.D. 303.

[4] Cf. Hippolytus, *Apost. Trad.*, X. 1, ed. G. Dix, 1937, 18. The number of years to be spent in the lower clerical orders before ordination to the presbyterate are laid down significantly in the " constitutio Sylvestri " in the *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, I (1884), 171.

quarter share of all charitable gifts to which the bishop is entitled, in favour of the poor and the strangers, but also defends successfully the Roman custom of fasts and feasts against certain Greek visitors.

Here follows, if we accept the logical arrangement of version B, the incident with the dragon. In order to show that the Pope's task is not only concerned with the arrangement of the internal affairs of the Church, the author tells us how Sylvester is called upon to deal with the dragon lying in wait under the Tarpeian rock below the Roman Capitolium in a cave, to which the Vestal virgins had brought sacrifices throughout the centuries of Rome's existence. With a superhuman courage he descends into the cave, accompanied by members of his clergy, and shuts it—or the mouth of the malicious monster, as well as the cave—thus bringing to an end the pagan ritual of the Vestal virgins. We are given to understand that this feat, which could not have been accomplished by human heroism alone, is the necessary preparation for the subsequent conversion of the Roman Emperor and his people.

Upon this scene enters Constantine, who has so far been a persecutor of the Church, and is therefore stricken with leprosy. Sylvester has to go into hiding from the terror of the persecution, and finds a refuge, together with his clergy, in the Sabine hills near Mount Soracte. Physicians and magi have tried and failed to cure the Emperor's disease, but now the " pontifices Capitolii " suggest to him a bath in the steaming blood of male babies. Three thousand of these infants with their mothers are duly brought to Rome at the Emperor's expense ; but when Constantine meets the mothers on his way to the Capitolium, instead of going forward with his cure, he delivers a noble speech on the subject of " pietas imperii Romani ", by which he says he is prohibited from pursuing this course, which is as nefarious as it is uncertain, and returns to his palace, sending home with rich gifts the overjoyed and surprised mothers with their babies. The same night he is granted a vision in his dreams. He sees the apostles Peter and Paul who betray to him the hiding-place of Sylvester as of the only man who can prepare a bath for him that will cure him. Thereupon the Pope and his clergy are brought

in, fearing the worst. Constantine, however, demands of the Pope to be instructed in Christianity, of which he is so ignorant as to mistake the Apostles for gods. Sylvester duly accepts him as a catechumen, instructs him in the faith and cleanses him in baptism of the impurity of body and soul, whereupon Constantine begins legislating impetuously in favour of the Church.

After these things there follows next the correspondence between Helena and Constantine. The Augusta, living in Bithynia together with the Emperor's two sons, Constans and Constantius, applauds Constantine's acceptance of a form of monotheism; but, being deeply impressed with the wisdom of the Jewish Rabbis with whom she converses, exhorts him to accept their purer religion in preference to Christianity. In answer the Emperor summons her to Rome together with her Jewish companions for a public disputation about Christianity and Judaism. She arrives there with a posse of Rabbis, selected by the Jewish "high priest", who himself excuses his absence with illness. The Emperor appoints two impartial pagans, Craton the philosopher and Zenophilus the civil servant, as arbitrators, the audience is convened, and twelve of Helena's Jewish retinue are delegated for the contest. On the Christian side Sylvester demands it as his right that he alone should represent the Christian cause. He refutes the Jewish arguments, as he has undertaken to do, by referring to the Old Testament only; but the conflict is not decided in that way. The final test comes only when Zambri, the Jewish miracle-worker, demands that a huge ox should be brought into the arena, and slays the beast by means of whispering the secret name of God in its ear.[1] Being unable to revive the animal, he is accused of sorcery, when Sylvester, not dismayed by this feat of Jewish magic, restores the beast to life in the Name of Jesus Christ. Thus Sylvester's triumph is complete, and arbitrators, Rabbis, even Helena herself, are baptized by him. An ox has been proved to be the Church's most successful missioner! Thereafter Constantine is dispatched to found Constantinople, and Helena to the invention of

[1] The magical use of God's secret name is fully evolved in medieval Jewish mysticism, cf. G. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish mysticism* (1955), p. 99. This seems an early witness to later Jewish magical practice.

the Holy Cross (these parts are missing from B), and, if we follow the A version, Sylvester to the taming of the Roman dragon.

IV

When the attempt is made to derive a portrait of Constantine from this phantasmagory—and it is meant to convey a definite impression of the Emperor's character to its readers—we find that all the most impressive features for a popular life of the "hero" Constantine, so carefully collected in Eusebius's *Vita Constantini*, are altogether omitted. Eusebius's assertions about his God-fearing father, Constantius I, and his mother, the devout Christian Helena, are not repeated in *Actus Sylvestri*. Missing are the daring escape from the court of the persecutor Galerius, his proclamation as Augustus by his father's army at the death of Constantius I, and his campaigns in Gaul. Passed over in silence are his victories over the "tyrant" Maxentius at the Milvian bridge, and over the "tyrant" Licinius at the Hellespont; and even the council of Nicea is not mentioned in one word. "Our historiographer Eusebius" has sadly curtailed the information available to him in his biography of Pope Sylvester; and it is salutary for the historian to ponder upon the fact that this was the picture of Constantine which was commonly seen in the West during the Middle Ages. We learn by it, how strongly our account of his life is influenced by the implicit trust which we are accustomed to put in the real Eusebius.

On the other hand, Constantine is represented as a persecutor of the Church, at Rome in particular but also of the whole Catholic Church, and we may well wonder whether Donatist influences might have been at work in presenting him in this garb. In the earlier manuscripts of version A he is also made the son-in-law of that archenemy of the Christian Church, Diocletian; and both these features seem to reflect the certain coolness which existed in the relations between the historical Pope Sylvester I and the Emperor, to which we have drawn attention elsewhere.[1] Constantine's mother Helena, too, is represented in the *Actus Sylvestri* as a God-seeking but rather credulous woman; and the Emperor himself escapes only by a hair's breadth from

[1] *Sav. Z. rom.* (1955), p. 168 n. 5; cf. *Polit. Metaphysik*, ii (1959), 263.

the temptation of becoming that which he was wont to call his adversaries, a tyrant. For his intended murder of the innocent would have stigmatized him as such, as in Greek mythology (Phalaris) and philosophy,[1] so also in Christian theology (Herod). Only in recognition of his unexpected withdrawal from perdition, in which he is helped by the idea of the Roman Empire, which is conceived of as a moral institution, Constantine receives—as the historical Constantine seems to have done—a vision in a dream. For, although the inescapable retribution for his misdeeds as a persecutor of the Church had already marked him, and made him unclean, he could still be saved. His vision, however, is not a vision of the Cross, or of Christ's monogram Chi Rho, it is a visitation by the two " Roman Apostles " Peter and Paul, who direct him to the one man who can cleanse him from his leprosy, the Roman Pope Sylvester. At the same time the complete lack of any Christian antecedents in Constantine is emphasized by the fact that he regards the two impressive figures whom he has seen in his dream as gods and thus makes it necessary for Sylvester to enrol him as an ordinary catechumen. After his baptism, however, Constantine has acquired so much knowledge, in particular of the Old Testament, that he appears capable of an active interference in the disputation of Sylvester with the Rabbis.

V

In view of the early date of the archetype of *Actus Sylvestri* the question has to be asked whether the author invented this portrait of Constantine, as he did, because he relied upon the short memories of his Roman readers, even though Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* had just been made available to them in Rufinus's Latin version; or whether he drew upon some independent source. Although Rufinus's translation cannot be regarded as a counterblast to the *Actus Sylvestri*—for this assumption would push back their date even further, possibly before A.D. 400, which seems impossible—it is yet reasonable to enquire into the antecedents of the Sylvester legend. A very learned, but also highly imaginative scholar, the late Dr. Vacher Burch of Liverpool, proposed some thirty years ago the thesis that there had been a

[1] *Polit. Metaphysik*, i (1959), 167 f.

Roman " Life of Constantine " as the basis of the *Actus Sylvestri*. This source, so he maintained, supported his view that Constantine had never built the basilica of St. Peter, nor any other church dedicated to an Apostle or patron Saint, and had been altogether—if a Christian at all—a very curious type of a Christian. The Roman origin of this assumed source he believed was vouched for by a strong admixture of Sabine folklore to the legend.[1] Unfortunately, Dr. Burch was ignorant of Levison's researches and this fact invalidates, to my mind, his main thesis —quite apart from its persuasiveness or otherwise.[2] However, he deserves our attention for a number of detailed observations which prove that the author of *Actus Sylvestri* was not only conversant with Eusebius—in Rufinus's translation—but also with Lactantius and other Latin Christian Fathers.

It cannot be doubted that the author of *Actus Sylvestri* intentionally neglected the Eastern version of Constantine's life ; but it appears, since he knew Lactantius, that he was equally undisturbed by the account of Constantine's vision in *De mortibus* XLIV. These two observations lead to the conclusion that the Sylvester-legend was in no way intended to give any sort of an historical account of events, but rather a surrealist, timeless appreciation of the Emperor. The quest for an historical source of its subject-matter, I believe, will be unavailing ; the task is rather to find the motives for such a compilation, and for this purpose it is as important to study its background. W. Kaegi has shown quite recently [3] how, starting from the *Actus Sylvestri*, Constantine was regarded throughout the Middle Ages as the model Emperor, and Dr. Burch, although he called it a " new rôle ", has established the same view for the whole of the sixteenth century.[4] There is also reason to believe that the disputation with the Rabbis was meant to show the way in which the model Emperor and the ideal Pope, Constantine and Sylvester, were

[1] V. Burch, *Myth and Constantine the Great* (Oxford, 1927).

[2] It is nevertheless to be regretted that J. Toynbee and J. W. Perking, *The Shrine of St. Peter* (1956), pp. 195 f., have taken no notice of the laborious analysis of the evidence for " Constantine's " distich upon the triumphal arch of old St. Peter's in Burch, op. cit. pp. 14 f.

[3] W. Kaegi, *Schweiz. Zeitschr. f. Geschichte*, viii (1958), 289 f.

[4] V. Burch, op. cit. p. 21, n. 2.

meant to co-operate in the supreme task in which the Church and the Empire were jointly concerned, the conversion of the Jews.

The fact that this is a task in which the Church is concerned, will hardly be doubted ; neither can it be denied that already in the course of the fourth century, and mainly under ecclesiastical pressure, the Jews had suffered serious civil degradation by law. The facts, already established by J. Parkes,[1] have been conveniently set out in a recent American study by J. E. Seaver.[2] The disputation thus deals with a question which was very much alive at the time when the archetype of *Actus Sylvestri* was written. But it has to be made evident why the Roman Church should have considered the conversion of the Jews as the supreme task of Church and Empire at that time. For this purpose we refer to that eschatological prophecy contained in St. Paul, Rom. xi. 25-6 :

" For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part has befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in ; and so all Israel shall be saved : even as it is written."

I have recently drawn attention to the fact that the prevailing historical theory of the time, especially at Rome, the theory of the rise and the fall of the world Empires, saw the last of these Empires in the Roman Empire, after whose fall the end of the world would come.[3] This theory had become popular, in the Roman Church in particular, through the speculations on the Antichrist by one Roman Father, Hippolytus, in the third century.[4] The signs of Rome's impending fall were clear enough to see, even for the Romans themselves, at the beginning of the fifth century. In 410 the city of Rome itself was stormed by Alaric's Visigoths, and no Camillus came to the rescue. It was, on the other hand, confidently assumed that the Roman Empire contained the " fulness of the Gentiles ", and their conversion had made an incredibly rapid advance in the course of the fourth century. The general historical situation was therefore such as

[1] J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (1934).

[2] J. E. Seaver, *Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire* (300-438), *Univ. of Kansas Publ., Human Ser.* xxx (1952), 19 f. Cf. also Ferrari dalle Spade in *Festschr. f. L. Wenger* (1945), II, 102 f.

[3] *Polit. Metaphysik* i (1959), 253 f.

[4] Ibid. ii. 126 f.

to give the greatest possible, i.e. an eschatological, significance to Sylvester's disputation with the Jews.

This preliminary consideration encourages us to assume that the disputation with the Jews formed part of the archetype of *Actus Sylvestri*, in spite of the fact that it differs so much in the two existing versions A and B. No argument against its genuineness may be drawn from the fact that it is also missing from a few of the manuscripts, for their number is said to be almost negligible.[1] We may also note with satisfaction that Dr. Burch has treated the disputation as genuine,[2] although it may be held that it constitutes a major embarassment to any suggestion that the ultimate source of *Actus Sylvestri* was an historical account of the life of the Emperor Constantine, if only of a popular sort. The fact to be explained is perhaps that the *Liber Pontificalis* contains no reference whatsoever to such a disputation ; and that, although mentioning the construction of a mausoleum for the Empress Helena,[3] it makes no mention of her baptism at the hand of Pope Sylvester, but only of the baptism of Constantine's sister, Constantia,[4] and his daughter. Whether there is any truth in these assertions or not is purely a matter of surmise ; but the omission of the Augusta Helena's baptism seems odd if it is assumed that *Actus Sylvestri* lay before the author of the *Liber Pontificalis*, a fact which may be concluded from the first entry under the name of Pope Sylvester I.[5] It would be tempting to assume that this author still possessed the archetype of the *Actus*, and that the information about the baptisms of Constantine's sister and daughter—there were two, but *Liber Pontificalis* does not say whether Constantina or Helena is meant—was obtained

[1] W. Levison, op. cit. 192.

[2] V. Burch, op. cit. pp. 163 f.

[3] *Liber Pont.*, ed. Duchesne, I, 182, "eisdem temporibus fecit Augustus Constantinus . . . mysileum ubi mater ipsius sepulta est. Helena Augusta, etc." Cf. the report on the recent excavations by F. W. Deichmann—A. Tschirn, *Das Mausoleum der Kaiserin Helena*, etc., *Jahrb. d. deutschen arch. Inst.*, lxxii (1957), 44 f.

[4] Ibid. p. 180, "eodem tempore fecit . . . baptisterium in eodem loco ubi et baptizata est soror eius Constantia cum filia Augusti a Silvestrio episcopo".

[5] Ibid. p. 170, "hic exilio fuit in monte Seracten et postmodum rediens cum gloria baptizavit Constantinum Augustum, quem curavit dominus a lepra, cuius persecutionem primo fugiens exilio fuisse cognoscitur."

from it. It seems, however, that we have to exclude this additional matter, because it is of alien origin, and at any rate the mausoleum for the Augusta Helena is an historical fact. Thus we have to admit that we cannot draw any valid conclusion from the silence of *Liber Pontificalis* either. For even if it has to be admitted that the further omission of Sylvester's struggle with the dragon is more easily explained, since its inclusion would have clashed with the whole character of *Liber Pontificalis*, the fact remains that the whole of book II of version A of *Actus Sylvestri* does not figure in the official papal register. This observation may suggest a simple, mechanical explanation for our problem: The compiler of *Liber Pontificalis* may just have failed to read the *Actus*—in whatever form—from cover to cover. In this he is not even to blame for any great carelessness. After all, the *Liber Pontificalis* had the main purpose of registering the various just or assumed titles for the vast possessions of the see of Rome. The entry under the name of Sylvester I already exceeded by far the normal limits of other papal entries, and economy of space was obviously a serious consideration. No donation was apparently recorded on the occasion of the Augusta Helena's baptism, if such it was.[1] There was, therefore, no need to record her baptism or any further adventures of Pope Sylvester in this particular document.

Having thus—as far as possible—established the material for a Sylvestrian picture of Constantine, we find one line running through the entire *Actus Sylvestri*, the denial of the Emperor's spiritual authority. Our document does not in any way question the Emperor's majesty. The fact that Constantine is entitled to lay down the rules governing the disputation between Sylvester and the Jews is nowhere put into question. It may even be held that Sylvester acts in the disputation as the Emperor's champion —just as the Rabbis act as Helena's champions—and in another context I hope to show that this interpretation is indeed the correct one, that the medieval conception of ordeal corresponds

[1] *Georgius Cedrenus*, ed. Imm. Bekker i, (1838,) 494, representing the B version, says only: "ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ μακαριωτάτη βασίλισσα Ἑλένη προσπεσοῦσα τοῖς ποσὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Σιλβέστρου παρεκαλεῖτο τόπον αὐτῇ μετανοίας παρασχηθῆναι." This may be understood as a case of "second penance" only.

more closely to the contest described in *Actus Sylvestri* than the Roman analogy of a gladiatorial contest, or the Byzantine analogy of the parties of the circus. However, although he fights as the Emperor's man, the triumph of Sylvester confirms his spiritual supremacy, not only over Helena, the Emperor's mother, but indeed over Constantine himself. Once more we may refer to the *Liber Pontificalis* for a commentary. This document cannot, of course, by-pass the Council of Nicea, as the *Actus Sylvestri* do. However, it pairs the ecumenical Council with a Roman synod held by Sylvester I in such a way as to make the latter appear as the far more impressive event.[1] To explain this somewhat boisterous attitude we have to remind ourselves that the Roman Church was fighting in this document a battle on more than one front. For it was Ambrose of Milan—Rome's dangerous rival at that time, as the imperial capital of the West—who conformed more closely to the ideal Pope, as outlined in *Actus Sylvestri*, than any of the Roman bishops.

VI

Finally we may ask what familiar features, if any, of the " historical " portrait of Constantine, as it is commonly drawn in our days, may be discovered in the account of him given in *Actus Sylvestri*. There are a number of constitutions and speeches attributed to Constantine in the legend ; and it is quite startling to hear from these inventions his familiar voice. We will give two examples. We read, for instance, in a constitution about the Christian chapel which he has ordered to be built in his Lateran palace : " Sit omnibus notum : Ita nos Christi cultores effectos ut intra palatium nostrum templum eius nomini construamus, in quo populus Christianus una nobiscum conveniens deitati eius gratias referamus." [2] Or we notice in another constitution the

[1] *Liber Pont.*, ed. Duchesne, I, 171, "hic fecit constitutum de omni ecclesia, etiam huius temporibus factum est concilium cum eius praeceptum (!) in Nicea Bithiniae ; et congregati sunt CCCXVII episcopi catholici, qui exposuerunt fidem integram, catholicam, immaculatam, et damnaverunt Arrium et Fotinum et Sabellium vel sequaces eorum. et in urbe Roma congregavit ipse cum consilio Augusti CCLXVII et damnavit iterum et Calistum et Arrium et Fotinum et Sabellium ; et constituit etc.", whereupon follows the famous forged *constitutio Sylvestri*.

[2] Boninus Mombritius, I, 281^{v} col. b, 38 f.

famous imperial impatience: "Habeant itaque, habeant iam finem isti errores. Abdicetur ista superstitio quam ignorantia concepit, stultitia nutrivit et aluit."[1] Of course, this is not the "historical" Constantine speaking or writing, although we may distinguish the same voice in the following "Constantinian" passages: "Quare nullus differat, sed prompto animo ad verissimam viam revertamini, ut quantum ea gratia ad vos pervenero debitas omnipotenti deo vobiscum confitear gratias."[2] Or in the Greek:

"ἦκε πρὸς ἐμέ, ἦκέ φημι, πρὸς θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον. πίστευσον ὡς ταῖς ἐμαυτοῦ πεύσεσι διερηνεύσομαί σου τὰ ἀπόρρητα τῆς καρδίας."

It is, therefore, obvious that the author of *Actus Sylvestri* was endowed with the same training in emphatic rhetoricism as the secretaries of the ecclesiastical bureau in Constantine's chancellery.[3]

However, this result is not without weight. It will, I venture to hope, deflate still more the conclusions with regard to Constantine's so-called self-testimony, which are built upon such "personal" documents as his letter to Arius from which our second instance has been drawn.[4] For that letter is not in the least "personal". Sad though it may appear, the idea of Constantine himself fighting for the salvation of Arius's soul has to be dismissed as being unhistorical. On the other hand, this chancellery style was not accessible to all and sundry. An author capable of composing a speech or a constitution with a genuine "Constantinian" ring was no common story-teller at a street corner, and this fact will appear more clearly still when we enquire into the historical antecedents of the disputation of Sylvester with the Rabbis.

Here the first point to be made is that Constantine's legislation concerning the Jews undoubtedly diminished their privileges. It

[1] Boninus Mombritius, I, 282[r] col. a, 42 f.

[2] H. G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Gesch. d. arian. Streits* (1935), 54, nr. 25 § 9.

[3] The existence of such a chancellery has now been claimed also by E. Volterra, *Mélanges Henri Lévy-Bruhl* (1959), pp. 325 f. on the basis of Cod. Theod. III. 16. 1, and *Accad. naz. dei Lincei, cl. di scienze morali, sect. VIII*, xiii. 61 f.

[4] H. G. Opitz, op. cit. 74, nr. 34, § 42.

is, however, incorrect to state with J. E. Seaver,[1] that " at the opening of the fourth century nothing marked the Jew off conspicuously from his neighbor ". The leading authority on the subject, Dr. Guido Kisch, has stated correctly that " although there is no definite proof that a distinctively Jewish dress was worn in antiquity, some biblical precepts necessitated, to a certain extent, a distinction of Jewish attire from that of the non-Jewish environment." [2] It is equally fallacious to assume with Seaver that Constantine's constitution of A.D. 321, permitting the city council of Cologne and, presumably, all other such councils,[3] to co-opt Jews as " decuriones ", was of itself a piece of intentionally anti-Jewish legislation. This measure was rather caused by the desperate state of public finance in the Empire of Constantine, aggravated still more at that time—and place—by the impending war against Licinius. The constitution must have made provision for the abolition of the official Emperor worship which the council had to offer, since the Jews were exempt from this part of official administration ; but apart from the famous inscription of Hispellum,[4] nothing is known of the secularization of the imperial cult in the cities of the western Empire. In any case, this legislation [5] served purely financial purposes and may therefore be dismissed from our consideration.

C'est le ton qui fait la musique, and other Constantinian pronouncements fulfil indeed all the requirements of intentional anti-Judaism. There are two constitutions in particular, Cod. Theod. XVI. 8. 1 and 5, and the much discussed letter in Eusebius, *Vita Const.*, III. 17 f. concerning the Easter date. As

[1] J. E. Seaver, *The Persecution of the Jews* (1952), p. 6.

[2] G. Kisch, *Historia Judaica*, xix (1957), 91 f.

[3] It has to be remembered that the official acts of worship in an imperial " colonia " were different from those in other townships, where local cults prevailed. The exemption of the Jews from the decurionate was based upon their religious status, and nothing seems to be known about the abolition of local official cults at the beginning of the Christian Empire. Cf. also M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (1948), p. 156, n. 6. On the possibility of an abolition of ritual sacrifices already by a law of Constantine, although the legislation in Cod. Theod. XVI. 10. 2 and 4 is only by Constantius II, cf. H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis* (1954), pp. 206 f.

[4] E. Beurlier, *Le culte impérial* (1891), pp. 297 f.

[5] The respective laws are conveniently enumerated in the appendix to J. Parkes, *The Conflict between the Church and the Synagogue* (1934), p. 379.

regards the latter, common opinion is nowadays very much inclined to accept it as an authentic pronouncement of Constantine's because of the discovery of that equally disputed document, Eusebius, *Vita Const.*, II. 26 f., on P. Lond. 878, of the first half of the fourth century.[1] This discovery probably invalidates the conclusions drawn by Battifol and others [2] on the grounds of their careful analysis of the text of the letter, as to the spuriousness of Constantine's proclamation about the Easter date. It does not, however, interfere with Battifol's observation: "The Emperor speaks here like a bishop" (shame on the bishops!). This is what he says: "And foremost it seemed inadmissible (*ἀνάξιον*) to celebrate that most holy feast by copying (*ἑπόμενοι*) the custom of the Jews who, having defiled their hands with lawless transgression, and justly being unclean, blindfold their souls also. . . . Let us have nothing in common with that most hostile Jewish mob. . . . For in what matter can those be right who, after the murder of the Lord, that parricide, are senseless and carried away without any reason, but by an unrestrained impulse, wheresoever their inborn madness takes them?" [3] A curious feat connects this letter with that to Arius, "*ὦ πατρόκτονε τῆς ἐπιεικείας*",[4] the predilection for "parricide" as a term of abuse. Here we may suspect the same mind at work, the ecclesiastical bureau of the imperial chancellery, and he is an earlier confederate of the author of *Actus Sylvestri*.

This episcopal diction is not much mollified in Constantine's constitution ad Euagrium of A.D. 315 in Cod. Theod. XVI. 8. 1:

Judaeis et maioribus eorum et patriarchis volumus intimari quod si qui post hanc legem aliquem qui eorum feralem fugerit sectam et ad dei cultum respexerit, saxis aut alio furoris genere (quod nunc fieri cognoscimus) ausus fuerit adtemptare, mox flammis dedendus et cum omnibus participibus concremandus. § 2. Si quis vero ex populo ad eorum nefariam sectam accesserit et conciliabulis eorum se adplicaverit, cum ipsis poenas meritas sustinebit. Dat. XV kal. Nov. Murgillo, Constantino A. IV. et Licinio IV coss.

First of all, although it is difficult to ascribe such an excerpt of a constitution to any particular style, we feel that it smacks of

[1] Cf. A. H. M. Jones, *J.E.H.* (1954), pp. 196 f.
[2] Quoted after H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins* (1954), p. 48.
[3] H. G. Opitz, op. cit. 55, nr. 26, §§ 3-5.
[4] Ibid. 73, nr. 35, § 33.

Church Latin.[1] Secondly the law illustrates well the way in which the anti-Jewish legislation grew out of an existing precedent. Conversion to Judaism had been prohibited by law first by way of the prohibition of circumcision of adult Gentiles in the later second century,[2] and I would suggest that the clause "poenas meritas sustinebit" has no other purpose than to enhance the continuing validity of those earlier laws.[3] From this point of view the constitution becomes a most interesting piece of evidence, since it shows how cleverly Constantine gave room for a Christian (if such it be) state legislation. The Christian hatred for the Jews was allowed to express itself in violent abuse, as "feralis" or "nefaria secta", but the practical significance of the law was almost nil. For Jewish riots at which pieces of rock ("saxa") were hurled at the Christians cannot have been very numerous, and the stake probably remained idle. However, it is to the great discredit of the Christian Church that it demanded that the very means should now be used against the Jews from which her own martyrs had suffered only six years earlier.

This survey of the Constantinian position ties up with the little that is known about the historical figure of the Roman Pope Sylvester I. When the Sylvester in *Actus Sylvestri* was given the task of convicting the Jewish Rabbis in a public disputation, its author may well have had before him the written record of Pope Sylvester's disputation with the Jew Noa, and also the anti-Jewish treatise written by the same Pope,[4] of which some fragments are still extant.[5] In general it cannot be denied that anti-Jewish feelings were fervent amongst the Gentile Christians both in the

[1] Cf. e.g. "ad dei cultum respexerit" with Sulpit. Sever., *Sacra Hist.* II. 40. 9, "ad cultum dei sese conferebant", as a technical description for conversion to Christianity.

[2] Add to the sources quoted in *Polit. Metaphysik*, ii (1959), 73 n. 3, *Scr. Hist. Aug., Severus XVIII.* 1.

[3] D. Gothofredus-Marvilius, ad h. l. vi. 214; 215a, assumes that the "poenae meritae" meant an arbitrary punishment, according to the decision of the magistrate, which I find hard to believe. But in either case it appears that the polemics of H. Dörries, op. cit., 170, n. 2, against M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (1948), p. 338, n. 1, are misconceived.

[4] Cf. on these remnants of Sylvester's literary activity H. Vogelstein Rome (1940), p. 105.

[5] M. Lat. VIII, 814.

West as well as in the East. A contemporary source to *Actus Sylvestri* is the massive invective against the Jews by John Chrysostom,[1] to which another Eastern source added the " historical " invention that Constantine had ordered the expulsion of all Jews from the territory of the Christian Roman Empire.[2] Such a " radical solution of the Jewish question " was preferred in the East because the eschatological view-point : " And then all Israel shall be saved " had been emphasized by Origen,[3] who from the end of the fourth century had assumed in the East the position of arch-heretic. Eschatology, therefore, had to be excluded from the treatment of the Jewish question in the East, where it was on the wane in any case.[4]

Western Christians no less neglected the law of Theodosius I reminding the whole Empire of the fact that Judaism was still a " religio licita " ;[5] and Ambrose as well as Augustine figure on the list of its enemies.[6] From this point of view the approach made by *Actus Sylvestri* is even to be commended. It seems to conform to the rule so often pronounced in his lectures by the late K. L. Schmidt : " The Gentiles we have to confute ; but with the Jews we have to dispute." That describes the very position in which Sylvester is symbolically placed by the author of *Actus Sylvestri*, and for this reason the theological approach of J. E. Seaver's book as well as of that of J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, may well be in need of a critical overhaul. It has to be asked, nevertheless, whether the *Actus Sylvestri* did not over-weigh the balance in the disputation with the Rabbis in favour of the Church. Admittedly the outcome, the victory of Sylvester, was a foregone conclusion in this type of literature. The liberality of Justin Martyr's Discussion with Trypho, where the disputants part in amicable disagreement, was never to be repeated after the political triumph of the Church ;

[1] Analysed by M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (1948), pp. 256 f.

[2] *Nestorian History*, XIX, *Patr. Or.*, IV, 281, quoted after J. E. Seaver, op. cit. p. 50, n., 63.

[3] R. Wilde, *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers* (1949), pp. 202 f.

[4] *Polit. Metaphysik*, ii (1959), 255 f.

[5] Cod. Theod. XVI. 8. 9 (A.D. 393), cf. M. Simon, op. cit. p. 156, n. 2.

[6] M. Simon, op. cit. pp. 254 f.

but we may well ask whether there was any intrinsic probability in the attitude taken by the Empress mother in favour of the Jewish religion? Has she not been brought into the conflict for the purely mechanical reason that the Jews must have an equally exalted sponsor as Sylvester had in the person of Constantine? And is not this idea sufficient proof for *Actus Sylvestri* being a romance rather than a semi-official forgery?

The fact that Judaism had attracted women members of ruling families in earlier centuries is well attested. Josephus referred on numerous occasions to the conversion of the royal house of Adiabene to Judaism,[1] and it is perhaps of some significance for the interpretation of *Actus Sylvestri* that the queen mother, who had prevailed upon king Izates of Adiabene to accept the Jewish religion, had also been called Helena. In any case, the incident is mentioned in the Latin Josephus,[2] and Sylvester's reference to Josephus in the course of the disputation [3] makes it clear that the author of *Actus Sylvestri* had some knowledge of this source. Furthermore, the relations between the house of Augustus and the house of Herod the Great had been very close; and the wife of Nero, Poppaea Sabina, had shown such a special interest in the Jewish rites that Josephus, Ant. XX. 8. 11, added to her name the remark "θεοσεβὴς γὰρ ἦν". Titus too, the captor of Jerusalem, had almost been captured himself by Berenice, the sister of Herod Agrippa II. In short, during the first century Judaism had played an important part at the court of the Augusti.

However, still more important than rehearsing these events in ancient history, is that we should establish the fact that the catastrophe which overtook Judaism twice in the sixty years from Nero to Hadrian did not extinguish its missionary efforts, and its attractiveness for the Gentiles. The fact that they both continued may be deduced already from the repeated laws prohibiting the circumcision of non-Jews which have been mentioned; but two questions in particular remain to be answered, the first, by what means did the Jews win the perpetual interest of the Gentiles,

[1] E. Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, 3rd edn., iii (1898), 119.
[2] E.g. *Hegesippus*, IV, 25. 3, *CSEL.*, 60, 280.
[3] Boninus Mombritius, II, fol. 284^{v}, a b.

and the second, whether they were still conspicuous enough to approach even members of the imperial house. In a recent article E. J. Bickermann has drawn attention to the discussion which went on in Mishna and Talmud about the sacrifices offered to Jehovah by the Gentiles.[1] This discussion reached its height at the beginning of the fourth century, more than two hundred years after the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem with the consequent cessation of official Jewish sacrificial worship.[2] In examining the practical importance of these discussions Bickermann, after dealing with conditions in the pre-Christian era, refers to the well-established Talmudic tradition that a Roman ruler called Antoninus was advised by the Patriarch Judah I (A.D. 170-210) on the method of offering such a sacrifice.[3] If the date of the Patriarch may be used for guidance, the "Roman ruler" could be identified with M. Aurelius or Commodus. Still closer to the time of *Actus Sylvestri* is another report preserved in the Talmud that a Sassanian queen, the wife of Hormizd II and mother of Shahpur II, the great adversary of Constantine as well as of his son Constantius II, showed great favour to the Jews, so much so that she was given instructions at the order of Rabba-bar-Joseph about the building of an altar to offer sacrifices to the God of heaven.[4]

If thus the historical possibility of the attitude taken by the Empress Helena cannot be denied, it has also to be admitted that the document by which the author of *Actus Sylvestri* makes her justify her favouring of the Rabbis has been invented with a remarkably clear appreciation of the religious issue involved :[5]

Domino semper Augusto, filio Constantino, mater Helena semper Augusta : Veritatem sapientis animus non recusat, nec fides recta aliquando patitur quamcumque iacturam benevolentiae divinae reputare debere, quod meruisti simulacrorum figmenta deserere. Sed errori applicamus humano quod Jesum Nazarenum deum credere voluisti ; et hunc dei filium esse in caelis aestimare qui a Judaeis

[1] E. J. Bickermann, "The altars of the Gentiles", *Revue internat. des droits de l'antiquité* (1958), pp. 137 f.

[2] E. J. Bickermann, op. cit. pp. 141 f.

[3] Ibid. pp. 152 f. It may be mentioned that under Augustus daily sacrifice had been performed in the temple at Jerusalem "in the name of the Emperor", H. Willrich, *Urkundenfälschungen* (1924), p. 9.

[4] Ibid. p. 153, n. 1.

[5] Boninus Mombritius, fol. 282^{v} b.

extitit oriundus, et magus accusatus sententiam crucis accipiendo defecit. Unde ad veritatis lumen scias attingere cupientibus alteram viam esse non posse nisi Hebraeorum acceperint legem. Pietati autem tuae ideo sanitas reddita probatur quia tu primus inter Augustos idolis renuntiasti. Deus ergo verus, qui est deus Judaeorum, ut ostenderet illos quos recusasti non esse deos veros fecit te salvari ut deposita formidine simulacrorum probes eos nec sanitatem conferre propitios, nec iratos auferre. Huius erroris finem deserentem deseruit pietatem tuam infirmitas. Nunc ad deum omnipotentem accedentem virtus comitabitur tecum quae superari non potest. Hunc ergo cum coeperis colere, obtinebis Davidicum clementer imperium et Salomonis sapientissimum et pacificum regnum. Eruntque tecum prophetae cum quibus locutus est deus, et omnia quae per eos poposceris impetrabis. Vale, etc.

This letter makes it clear that there was a feeling of mental superiority amongst those who had accepted monotheism. It may also well illustrate the constant guard against monarchianism, especially Sabellianism, which was kept by the Catholic Church to the end of the fourth century. On the other hand, we find this quasi-intellectual approach closely related to the material which Bickermann has collected.[1] It was not so much the God of the Old Testament who was worshipped at those " altars for the Gentiles " ; Judaism was much rather seen by these worshippers as the purest form of monotheism, the worship of the supreme God—without a name and without an image. Neither did Christianity remain un-influenced by this approach. For here, we believe, lay the roots for the development of the *via negationis* in the definition of the Divine in medieval scholasticism.

One last remark has to be made about the way in which *Actus Sylvestri* treats with the " Jewish high priest ". We feel tempted to see that disparaging remark in connection with the great position which the Jewish Patriarch Gamaliel had obtained under Theodosius the Great and his subsequent fall under Honorius and Theodosius II (Cod. Theod. XVI. 8. 28. A.D. 415). It appears that Gamaliel, who had been accorded the rank of " praefectus praetorio " by Theodosius the Great, had taken it upon himself to decide in law-suits between Jews and Christians, and that he was therefore deprived of this honour by the constitution of Theodosius II. It may even be argued that the institution of two pagan arbitrators for the disputation between Sylvester and the Rabbis is a reflection upon the exercise of

[1] E. J. Bickermann, op. cit. pp. 153 f.

judicial power by Gamaliel in such-like cases. If this supposition should prove to be correct, it would provide us with the year 415 as a *terminus ante quem* for the origin of *Actus Sylvestri*, since no similar position was granted to a Jewish leader at any later date.[1]

These considerations may, we hope, show that *Actus Sylvestri* well deserve a more careful study than they have received so far, even by those who seek for more information about the historical Emperor Constantine; and that the seemingly least attractive part of them, Sylvester's disputation with the Rabbis, may yet be the most informative with regard to Constantine as well as in other directions. It has not been my ambition to give more than a very preliminary survey. To do more will not be possible unless and until at least a text—if not a critical edition—is produced; but even such a modest scratching of the surface seems to indicate the promise offered for future research in this field.

[1] Cf. O. Seek in Pauly-Wiss. VII, 690, and in particular Siro Solazzi, B. I. D. R. "Vittorio Scialoja", xliv (1937), 298, n. 2.

THE FEDERALIST MOVEMENT IN CAEN DURING THE FRENCH REVOLUTION [1]

By A. GOODWIN, M.A.
PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

A TRUE understanding of the federalist insurrection in the north-west of France in 1793 depends upon a close study of political attitudes and events in and around Caen. It was there, after all, that the standard of revolt in the north against the dominating influence of the Paris commune was first raised. It was the departmental officials of the Calvados at Caen who set the example of flouting and then rejecting the authority of the National Convention. The local authorities in Caen not only took this initiative, but supplied the effective political leadership of the rising as it spread to other departments. As is well known, Caen became the chief refuge for several of the Girondin leaders who escaped from Paris after their expulsion from the Convention on 2 June 1793, and it thus became a focus of anti-Jacobin opinion, and an object of general interest in the country at large. As I shall show later, one of the decisive reasons for the collapse of federalism in the north-west was that Caen withdrew its support from the movement, instead of continuing the struggle after Brécourt. Quite obviously, the role played by Caen in the Northern insurrection was of the same order of importance as that played by Marseilles, Bordeaux or Lyons in the South. It is somewhat strange, therefore, to find that we still lack a scholarly study of the federalist movement in the Calvados.[2]

[1] A lecture delivered in the Library series of public lectures.

[2] The movement in the adjacent departments of the Orne and the Eure has, however, been studied and incidental light on the situation in Calvados thus provided. See for example, P. Nicolle, " Le mouvement féderaliste dans l'Orne en 1793 ", *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, xiii (1936), 481-512 ; xiv (1937), 215-33 ; xv (1938), 12-53, 289-313 and 385-410. A. Montier, " Le départment de l'Eure et ses districts en Juin 1793 ", *La Révolution Française*, xxx (1896), 128-55, and L. Dubreuil, " Evreux au temps du féderalisme ", Ibid. lxxviii (1925), 244-63 and 318-48.

This is because the sources for such a study are so fragmentary and so difficult to interpret. The main collection of printed and manuscript material in the departmental archives of the Calvados dealing with the risings—the L series—has had an unfortunate history and is only now in course of classification.[1] Some of the original records which survived remained in private hands and one of the most important of such collections was broken up and sold in 1895.[2] More recently, however, the sources for the study of Norman federalism have become more accessible for study—partly by the publication of such indispensable documents as the contemporary reports of the secret agents of the Minister of the Interior, and partly through the return to the departmental archives of the Calvados of important manuscript collections formerly in private possession.[3] Some progress in the study of these documents has already been made, notably by Mademoiselle J. Grall, but no satisfactory general account of the rising has yet been written.[4]

Before turning to my first problem—that of the origins of the political hostility of Caen towards the so-called " anarchists " in the capital—I need to say a word or two about the city itself at the end of the eighteenth century. Just before the revolution, Caen had a population of about 35,000 inhabitants.[5] It was an important commercial and industrial centre—where, as Arthur Young tells us, silk lace, cotton goods and worsted stockings were

[1] Part of the series was destroyed as " useless " and another part (affaires militaires depuis 1792) was sold in 1862. *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départmentales postérieures à 1790* (*Calvados*), Série L, i (Caen, 1906), ed. A. Bénet, pp. iv-v.

[2] Ibid.

[3] P. Caron, *Rapports des agents du Ministre de l'Intérieur dans les départements*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1951). In 1923 M. T. Genty, Vice-President of the Société des Bibliophiles Normands, restored to the archives fourteen bundles of manuscripts which had belonged to Pierre-Jean l'Evêque, president of the departmental executive in 1793. My attention was drawn to these papers by Mlle. Grall, who has greatly assisted me in guiding me through the collection.

[4] See, in particular, Mlle. Grall's study of Bougon-Longrais in *Bulletin de la société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, liii (1956), 422-34 and of the Administrative Council of the army of the Côtes de Cherbourg in *Annales de Normandie* (1958), pp. 353-63.

[5] In 1775 the population of Caen was estimated at 35,371. *Inventaire-Sommaire des Archives Départmentales Antérieures à 1790* (*Calvados*), *Archives Civiles*, Série C, i (1877), 46.

extensively manufactured.[1] It boasted an ancient university, was the seat of powerful courts of justice, and possessed some of the finest examples of Romanesque and Gothic ecclesiastical architecture. It had a proud cultural tradition, and its inhabitants had the independence and forthrightness of their Norman ancestors. Before 1789 Caen had been the headquarters of an *intendant* and after the revolution it had become the administrative capital of the department of the Calvados. It was also the market centre of a rich agricultural region and a source of supply for the provision trades of Paris. It was the hub of road communications in the north-west and, from the military point of view, it stood in a vital strategical relation to the capital. Lastly, Caen was the home of a prosperous and well-educated Protestant community. These were some of the factors which helped to shape the political attitudes of the local inhabitants during the period of which I shall be speaking.

The seeds of political discord between Caen and the Paris Commune had been sown at the time of the overthrow of the monarchy in August 1792. It was not that the departmental administrators of the Calvados had objected to the establishment of the republic, nor that, later, they questioned the execution of Louis XVI. They had, however, been shocked by the September massacres which they had been taught to regard as the work of the Paris Commune, and they had been alienated by the rumours of the impending establishment of a triumvirate or dictatorship.[2] Marat they regarded with aversion as the leader of the "anarchists" in the capital, and as the man who had recommended the extension of the massacres to the provinces as a short way with the counter-revolutionaries. As constitutionalists they also objected to the swollen influence of the Paris Commune and to the way in which the legislative processes of the National Convention were being seriously hampered by the Jacobin minority.[3] These reactions had, no doubt, been

[1] *Travels in France*, ed. C. Maxwell (1929), p. 308.

[2] Address of Department to Convention, 15 October 1793, *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départmentales postérieures à 1790* (*Calvados*), Série L, i (Caen, 1906), p. ix note.

[3] Vaultier, *Souvenirs de l'Insurrection Normande dite du Fédéralisme en 1793* Caen, 1858), p. 151.

provoked in Caen by the account of the political situation in the capital which they had received from the representatives of the Calvados in the Convention, most of whom belonged to the Girondin majority.[1] This accounts for Calvados's early sympathy with the idea of a departmental guard for the National Convention, especially as it was championed by Buzot, who came from the adjacent Eure department.[2] This attitude hardened early in January 1793, when the Calvados deputies complained to their constituents that the assembly was under increasing pressure from unruly elements in the Paris sections and that the *Septembriseurs* were receiving every encouragement from Pache at the War Ministry.[3] Between 15 October 1792 and the middle of May 1793 these feelings had been expressed in a series of public addresses from the Department to the Convention.[4]

It would, however, be wrong to conclude from this that the departmental officials in Caen identified themselves completely with the political views of their own Girondin deputies or approved wholeheartedly of their conduct in the Convention. When, early in March 1793, the French armies were in retreat in the Netherlands, the department expressed its complete solidarity with the Convention, approved such Jacobin measures as the institution of the Revolutionary Tribunal and the taxation of the rich, and pleaded for the national control of corn prices.[5] At the time of General Dumouriez's desertion to the Austrians in April the departmental and municipal officials of Caen appealed to the

[1] There are a number of manuscript letters from de Cussy to the municipal authorities from October 1792 to mid-April 1793 in the Archives Municipales, Série I (33) and (34) at Caen.

[2] *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départmentales* (*Calvados*), Série L, i, p. ix. The first address dated 15 October 1793 contained a request for the organization of a Departmental guard.

[3] Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 151. In an address dated 2 January 1793 the department told the Convention that an armed contingent of national guards from the Calvados was about to leave for the capital. *Inventaire Sommaire* (*Calvados*), i. 323-4.

[4] The dates of these addresses were 15 October 1792, 2 January 1793, 12 March, 19 April, 6 and 10 May 1793.

[5] Address to National Convention, 12 March 1793. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 34 (3).

politicians in the Convention to put an end to their mutual recriminations, to deal firmly with the handful of *factieux* in the assembly and to push on with the essential task of framing a constitution.[1] By the middle of May, however, not merely the departmental, but also the municipal and judicial authorities in Caen had come round to the view that the time for such petitions was past. If the sovereign independence of the National legislature was to be preserved, either the assembly would have to quit Paris and seek a safer refuge in the provinces, or departmental armies would have to go to the capital to protect it.[2] Girondin propaganda had thus eventually created the impression in Caen that Paris was a city given over to bloodthirsty terrorists intent on pillaging private property and that the situation was beyond the control of the police or the Parisian national guard.[3] At the same time the Calvados deputies had persuaded their constituents that all this trouble had been created by a small minority of anarchists or intriguing politicians and that the inhabitants of Paris would welcome the help of the provincials in getting rid of them.[4] The primary task would, however, be to liberate the National Convention from the insults and humiliations heaped upon it by the mobs in the galleries and to terminate the factional strife which was preventing it from dealing with the multiplying problems of national defence and from endowing France with settled republican institutions.

This mood of exasperation with Jacobin extremism in Paris was not confined in Caen to the respectable middle class members of the local administration. It was felt also by the members of the city's popular clubs and societies. The Jacobin society, of Caen, for example, had repudiated its affiliation to the Jacobin club in Paris and the five " sectional " or ward assemblies of the city were equally violent in their criticisms of political trends in

[1] Address, 19 April 1793. *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départmentales (Calvados)*, Série L, i. 359.

[2] Addresses of 6 and 10 May 1793. Ibid. pp. 371-3.

[3] This view was propagated by Gorsas's *Courrier des 83 Départements*, which had a wide circulation in the city and also by the local news-sheet—*Affiches, Annonces, Avis divers, ou journal du Département du Calvados.*

[4] For example, Cussy's letter to the municipal officers of 31 October 1792. Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, pp. 148-9.

the capital.[1] The most important of these political societies, in Caen, and the most representative of local feeling, was the *société des Carabots*.[2] The origin of this corporation went back to the summer of 1789 when, as elsewhere in France, a National Guard had been formed in the city without legal sanction. Boycotted by the local aristocracy, this guard had been staffed by artisans. Its commander had been a farrier, one of its captains was a cobbler and among its officers were a tailor, a wig-maker and a cook. All these, and even their sergeants and corporals, wore swords—a privilege hitherto reserved to the nobility. Inevitably, this motley collection, and especially its corporals, soon became the butt of the local royalists. It was in this way that the term *carabots*—which meant vagabonds or ne'er-do-wells—had been applied to this guard, largely as a matter of derision and because of its analogy with the word " corporals " or *caporaux*.[3] When in October 1791 the national guard throughout France had been regularized, these self-constituted officers had lost their status and privileges, but had retained their uniforms and self-esteem. They had also clung affectionately to the title of *Carabots*. They were, in fact, the *sans-culottes* of Caen. Early in February 1793 the *Carabots* had decided to re-form themselves as a partly political and partly military organization. They had adopted as their motto, which they displayed on their banner and wore on their silk armlets, the stern republican device : " The execution of the law or death "—represented by a skull and cross-bones. Although still extra-legal, the society had been recognized, or even sponsored, by the local authorities—and one of the departmental officials—Le Normand—had thought it not below his dignity to become its first president. It is quite possible that the organization may have been encouraged for

[1] The five sections of the city were called *Liberté, Egalité, Civisme, Union* and *Fermeté*. They held their meetings respectively in the Eudist church, the chapel of the Hotel de Vassy, the University law school, the abbey of St. Stephen and the church of the Sepulchre.

[2] See C. Renard, *Notice sur les Carabots de Caen* (Caen, 1858) and, particularly, Mancel's editorial account in Vaultier's *Souvenirs*, pp. 126-45.

[3] The expression *Carabots* was apparently derived from the rallying cry " Carabo ", used by rioters and machine-breakers from Paris who had caused havoc in Rouen in July 1789. Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 127.

ulterior motives—as the nucleus of a possible departmental army. Whatever the cause, the society had expanded rapidly and soon had affiliated societies in the surrounding country districts. Just before the revolt it had been employed by the local authorities on missions and house-to-house searches at night and it may, in this sense, be thought of as a well organized group of vigilantes, who were both feared and respected. It was also one of the most active of the political clubs, whose members seem to have deferred to the opinions of the local authorities. In the spring of 1793 the *Société des Carabots* was anti-Jacobin.

The political movement which developed into the federalist insurrection of the north-west of France was precipitated in Caen on the night of Thursday, 30 May 1793. The initiative seems to have come from the local Jacobin and *Carabot* societies, to have been sponsored, or perhaps even suggested, by the district and departmental authorities, and to have secured the tardy and somewhat reluctant consent of the commune.[1] On the day before, news had reached Caen of the political crisis in Paris on 27 May, when the Girondin Commission of Twelve had been suppressed as the result of pressure on the Convention from the sections. The call for action from the popular societies in Caen was given formal sanction by the *procureur général* of the district, Louis Caille—who was to prove one of the most influential and energetic leaders of the revolt. At 10 p.m. on the 30th Caille requisitioned the municipal corporation to summon an immediate meeting of the sections and of the general council of the commune.[2] When the municipal assembly met at 10.15, however, the bells of Caen were already pealing out the summons for the meeting of the sections—in other words the formal consent of the commune had been by-passed. This affront seemed all the more serious to the town councillors because they were afraid that the sound of the church bells would cause a panic in the surrounding countryside. If that happened then the market to be held on the following day in Caen would probably not be provisioned and

[1] *Affiches du Calvados*, 2 June 1793.

[2] The signed manuscript requisitions are in the Genty Collection in the Departmental Archives.

bread and flour were already in short supply.[1] The councillors also appear to have been ignorant of what was afoot at the department, for delegates were dispatched there to inquire the reason for this precipitate summons of the local assemblies and to lodge a protest against the ringing of the church bells. When the mayor—Goupil Duclos—put in an appearance at 11 p.m. these messengers brought back the news that another and final petition from the department to the Convention was contemplated and that the support of all the local inhabitants was being sought. Shortly afterwards the bellringer of the parish of Notre Dame of the *Civisme* section reported that when he had refused to toll the church bells without formal authorization from the commune, his keys had been seized by force and the bells rung.[2] As, by this time, some of the other sections were already assembling, the municipal assembly accepted the *fait accompli* and ordered the town crier Barbot—who was a member of the *Carabots*—to summon the rest of the sections by drumming the *Carabot* call to arms. The assembly also nominated four delegates to attend the general meeting at the department.[3]

This plenary session of all the local administrative and judicial officials and of the delegates of the popular societies was held at 2 a.m. on the morning of 31 May. After L'Evêque, the president of the department, had explained the reasons for the meeting, several resolutions were carried, but only after prolonged debate.[4] A departmental armed force was to be formed at once and held in readiness to march on the capital. An invitation to follow this example was to be sent to all the other departments in France. An address from the assembly announcing these measures was to be taken to the National Convention in Paris by

[1] MS. Régistre des délibérations du Corps municipal et du Conseil général de la Commune de Caen (4 January 1792-11 germinal an II), fol. 152^{v}. Archives Départementales du Calvados.

[2] Interrogation of Goupil Duclos, 3 September 1793. Lm. Genty (Mission Lindet, Insurrection Fédéraliste). The mayor's testimony is corroborated by the above register, fol. 153.

[3] Interrogation of Jean Michel Barbot, 31 August 1793. Lm. Genty (Mission Lindet, Insurrection Fédéraliste).

[4] *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départementales postérieures à 1790 (Calvados)*, Série L, i. 384-5.

ten commissioners elected on the spot.[1] These delegates were also instructed to ask the National Assembly to require that the Paris Commune should present its financial accounts.[2] The resolutions represent a combination of revolutionary action and constitutional procedure which was to be characteristic of the Caen insurrection.[3] The call to arms to the other departments was irrevocable, but, so far as the Calvados was concerned, further action was postponed until its appointed delegates had reported back to their constituents.

The commissioners left Caen on 1 June and arrived in Paris late on the evening of the 2nd only to find that the Convention had been surrounded that same day by the Parisian National Guard and forced to decree the arrest of twenty-two Girondin deputies, the members of the Commission of Twelve and three ministers. In reporting on the events in a letter to their constituents on the following day the delegates concluded that the republic could only be saved "by a concerted effort"—by which they obviously meant a union of the departments against the capital.[4] The use of this phrase is significant because on the same day the commissioners had held lengthy consultations with members of the Calvados delegation to the Convention and with some of the leaders of the Girondins, such as Barbaroux, Pétion, Valazé and Lanjuinais. The letter also referred to a "confirmed report" that, on 2 June, bribery had been used to incite the masses to murder the offending Girondins. It pointed out that the Convention had only been saved by its resolution in attempting to effect a collective exit from the assembly. The only crumb of

[1] *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départementales postérieuses à 1790 (Calvados)*, Série L, i, 384-5. The ten elected were Le Normand, President of the *Carabots*, Louis Caille, Tabouret, Feret, Marie, Levasnier, Chappes, Dom Mauger, René de Normand and Legagneur. The last named was unable to leave Caen owing to illness.

[2] The financial malpractices of the Commune were a common item of Girondin criticism.

[3] M. E. G. Léonard has suggested that this cautious legalism owed something to the fact that several of the ringleaders of the insurrection—such as Châtry Lafosse (aîné), Mesnil, and L'Honoré—were Protestants. *Bulletin des Antiquaires de Normandie*, xlv (1937), 324-5.

[4] Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 35 (1). Printed by Mancel in Vaultier's *Souvenirs*, pp. 169-70.

comfort that could be offered was the impression that the disgraceful scenes in the Convention had not secured the approval of the majority of the Parisians, who seemed well aware of the indignation that would be provoked in the provinces. This letter could only have confirmed the worst fears of the inhabitants of Caen and when it was followed by newspaper reports of the crisis, it led to insurrectionary motions being passed in several of the sectional assemblies, even before the return of the commissioners.[1] It is revealing to note that these motions had been provoked anonymously by one of Caen's leading citizens—the elder Châtry Lafosse, president of the commercial court.[2]

When the commissioners returned to Caen on 8 June they had further unpalatable news to report to the general assembly of the department. They explained that their insistence on completing their mission, despite the contrary advice of the Girondin deputies, had been fruitless. The President of the Convention had prevented the presentation of the address, on the ground that all such petitions had just been referred to the Committee of Public Safety—where they would, no doubt, receive indecent burial. The commissioners also gave a vivid and alarming account of the scenes in the Convention on 2 June, described their own harrowing experiences in the capital, and mentioned two incidents which had occurred at Evreux on 6 June on their way back. The first was that they had fallen in with one of the Minister of the Interior's secret agents. Believing them to be Jacobins, this individual had revealed to them, in confidence, the plans for the establishment of a dictatorship in Paris, for the equalization of private incomes, and for the domination of France by the Paris Commune. This had seemed to them proof positive of all the allegations against the Commune that had been rife in Caen. Whilst at Evreux, they had also attended and addressed a meeting of the Eure department, which had, in their presence, resolved to raise an army of four thousand men and to concert measures against the capital with other departments.[3]

[1] Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 12. [2] Ibid. p. 13.

[3] This account is based on the full printed report of the commissioners in Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (8). Mancel in his edition of Vaultier's *Souvenirs* gives only extracts. For the Evreux decisions see M. L. Boivin-Champeaux, *Notices pour servir à l'histoire de la révolution dans le département de l'Eure* (1884), p. 48.

On the motion of one of the delegates, Louis Caille, the departmental assembly resolved that the commissioners should forthwith report to the various sectional assemblies of the city and, that a plenary session of all the local authorities should be held the same night, to be attended also by deputies from the popular clubs and societies.[1]

It was this meeting, held at 2 a.m. on 9 June, which committed Caen and the Calvados to the federalist insurrection. Bougon-Longrais, friend and confidant of Charlotte Corday and *procureur-général syndic* of the department,[2] reported that the sections, when consulted, had expressed a unanimous demand for " extraordinary measures " to assure the unity and indivisibility of the republic and the protection of life and property in the capital. This prompted the general assembly to declare itself " in a state of insurrection and of resistance to oppression " and to assert that it would not lay down its arms until the National Convention had recovered its liberty. An appeal had thus been made to the sacred right of resistance contained in the Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789. The " extraordinary measures " to which the assembly then gave its formal approval were, in fact, all either illegal or revolutionary in some degree or other. The most serious was the decision to place under provisional arrest in the castle at Caen, as hostages for the proscribed Girondin leaders, two of the *représentants en mission* accredited to the army of the coasts of Cherbourg, Romme and Prieur (de la Côte d'Or).[3] This decision, although retaliatory, violated the principle of the immunity of parliamentary delegates which could only be legally infringed by a decree of the Convention. The task of arresting these deputies at Bayeux was entrusted to the *Carabots*. The

[1] *Extrait du Procès-verbal des séances du Conseil-Général du departement du Calvados*, 8 June 1793. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (8), p. 19.

[2] For Bourgon-Longrais see Mlle. J. Grall's article in *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, liii (1955-6), 422-34.

[3] This army had been formed in April 1793 under the general supervision of General Labourdonnaye to protect the French coast, from Honfleur to Mont St. Michel, against English naval attack. See Mlle. J. Grall, " La défense des Côtes Calvadosiennes pendant la période révolutionnaire ", *Actes du 81e Congrès des Sociétés Savantes. Rouen-Caen, 1956*, pp. 501-14, and also her article on the Administrative Council of this army in *Annales de Normandie* (October 1958), pp. 353-63.

department of La Manche was also invited to arrest the other two deputies *en mission* to the Cherbourg coastal forces—Lecointre and Prieur (de la Marne). Secondly, the departmental and district paymasters were forbidden to disburse any of their funds except on the warrant of the departmental executive, thus overriding possible instructions from the central government, and placing public revenue at the disposal of the insurrectionary authorities. The movement of military convoys and ammunition which had recently arrived in Caen was also countermanded. Count Félix de Wimpffen, the local commander of the Cherbourg coastal army, was invited to an " amicable conference " with the departmental authorities, obviously with a view to his assuming the control of the departmental army of the Calvados.[1] This was a move to bring over to the insurrection a proved military commander and to suborn part of the republican forces in the area. Finally, a provisional insurrectionary committee was elected to concert further action.[2]

The *Carabots* immediately arrested Romme and Prieur at Bayeux and after interrogation the two deputies were handed over to the municipal authorities who provided them with comfortable

[1] Wimpffen had been appointed local commander of the Cherbourg coastal army on 22 February 1793. Born in 1745, he was a native of the Duchy of Zweibrücken. He had joined the French service, fought in Corsica, and at the siege of Gibraltar. Elected as deputy of the order of the nobility to the States General, he had assisted in military reforms in the Constituent Assembly. In 1792 he had distinguished himself in the defence of Thionville as lieutenant commander, though his attitude appears to have been equivocal. P. Heckmann, *Félix de Wimpffen et le siège de Thionville en 1792* (1926). Wimpffen was a crypto-royalist at the time of the rising. See R. Postel, *Une rectification du fédéralisme en Normandie. Félix de Wimpffen et les Girondins réfugiés* (Caen, 1867). According to Vaultier (*Souvenirs*, p. 15) Wimpffen had been recommended as general to the insurrectionists by the brothers Châtry de Lafosse. For evidence that Wimpffen was in touch with the English government in the spring of 1793 see Mlle. J. Grall's article, " Archives Londoniennes, Epoque du Fédéralisme ", in *Bulletin des Antiquaires de Normandie*, liv (1957-8), 1-19.

[2] Its members were Le Normand, Vice-President of the Department, Louis Caille, *procureur-syndic* of the District, Châtry de Lafosse (elder), municipal officer, Picquot, public prosecutor, and Costy, Tabouret, Le Carpentier, Barbot and L'Honorey—representing the popular clubs and sections. *Extrait du Procès-verbal des séances du Conseil Général du département du Calvados*, 9 June 1793. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (8), p. 24.

quarters in the precincts of the castle at Caen.[1] By 12 June General Wimpffen had agreed to command the departmental forces. Prompt action was taken by the Insurrectionary committee to extend the rising to the adjacent departments, to bring economic pressure to bear on the capital and to push ahead with military preparations.

The most urgent task was to obtain the support of the other departments in the north-west, and here the Calvados followed the lead already given by the Eure and the Orne departments, both of which had decided on 6 June, to dispatch commissioners to the adjacent departments to encourage a general movement of resistance.[2] On 12 June sixteen of the most prominent supporters of the revolt in Caen, including two members of the committee of insurrection, were detailed to carry out similar propaganda missions in an area stretching across the whole of north-west France from the Somme to the Loire.[3] These commissioners, like the *représentants en mission* of the Convention, worked in pairs and each pair was assigned two departments as its field of activity. In general the agents who operated in the Breton departments were well received and given enthusiastic promises of support.[4] The most vital missions, however, were

[1] The deputies were allowed to retain their papers, among which were documents " sur l'éducation publique " belonging to Romme. These may have been initial drafts of the scheme for a republican calendar, on which Romme is supposed to have worked whilst in captivity at Caen. Lm. Réintégration Genty (Mission Lindet), Archives du Calvados.

[2] For these decisions see A. Montier, " Le département de l'Eure et ses districts en Juin 1793 ", *La Révolution Française*, xxx (1896), 145 and P. Nicolle, " Le mouvement fédéraliste dans l'Orne en 1793 ", *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, xv (1938), 13.

[3] Louis Caille and Chaix d'Est-Ange were sent to La Manche and Ille-et-Vilaine ; Caille (junior) and Le Normand to the Côtes du Nord and Finistère ; Petit and Le Nouvel to Eure et Loire and Loire et Cher ; Bougon and Dom Mauger to Seine Inférieure and Somme ; Renouf-la-Coudraye and Devic to Morbihan and Loire-Inférieure ; Varin and Laberge to Mayenne and Mayenne-et-Loire ; Marie and Boiszerard to Eure and Orne ; Legrix and Lacouture to Sarthe and Indre-et-Loire. Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 206.

[4] Only one of the reports of these commissioners—that of Caille and Le Normand on their activities in the Côtes du Nord and Finistère—appears to have survived. It was partly at their suggestion, and certainly with their encouragement, that five of the Breton departments in general assembly at Rennes decided to send delegates to Caen on 19 June. L[m]. Fédéralisme, Imprimés, Bulletins, Affaires Générales, Archives du Calvados.

those to the department of La Manche, covering the Cherbourg peninsula, to the Seine-Inférieure, which controlled the river approaches to Paris and to the department of the Sarthe, which was at that moment threatened by the advance of the royalist rebels in La Vendée. Unfortunately for the prospects of success none of these particular missions, for reasons which will be explained, fulfilled their objectives. Meanwhile, from 9 June onwards, a number of proscribed Girondin deputies, who had escaped from Paris, began to arrive in Caen, having been invited to seek refuge there by de Cussy, one of the Calvados deputies to the Convention.[1] Most of the contemporary evidence suggests that these refugee deputies abstained from direct participation in the organization of the insurrection, but their presence in Caen gave added importance to the city as a regional centre of the federalist movement and their speeches, pamphlets and manifestos gave further impetus to the insurrection.[2]

What was needed, however, once the rising had been launched, was action rather than speeches and one of the most important of the early decisions taken by the department, on the recommendation of the insurrectionary committee, was an attempt to deprive Paris of supplies of meat, corn and general farm produce from the whole of Normandy. This decision was reached in two stages—on 11 June the general assembly of the department resolved that the transport of all essential food supplies in Caen destined for the Paris markets should be provisionally suspended. A week later this partial and provisional suspension was confirmed, extended to the whole department and recommended as for imitation by other departments.[3] This involved, of course,

[1] The most important of the Girondin deputies who came to Caen were Barbaroux, Buzot, Gorsas, Kervélégan, Louvet, Pétion, and three members of the Commission des Douze, Bergoing, Henri Larivière and Salles. The full list of those who reached Caen is given by Mancel in Vaultier's *Souvenirs*, p. 275.

[2] The local newspaper—*Affiches du Calvados*—noted on 23 June 1793: "Nous avons beaucoup de députés dans nos murs; mais ils n'ont rien influé sur le parti que nous avons pris. Ils ne paraissent point à l'administration et rarement se montrent-ils aux sociétés populaires." Among Barbaroux's secretaries, however, was Girey-Dupré, author of the marching song of the revolt, *La Marseillaise des Normands*. See Vaultier's *Souvenirs*, pp. 276-7 for the text.

[3] The resolution of 11 June appears as a manuscript extract in L[m]. Federalisme (Correspondance, arrêtés, Juin, Juillet et repression). Archives du Calvados; that of 18 June as a printed extract in Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (45).

blocking the road communications with the capital. This measure provoked an immediate letter of protest from Pache, who was then mayor of Paris, to the district authorities in Caen. In this Pache pleaded for the formal disavowal of the embargo on the ground that it was inspired by counter-revolutionary motives and that, if generally adopted, it would ruin, not merely Paris, but Normandy itself.[1] Though this letter did nothing to change the attitude of the departmental authorities, who regarded it as an attempt to sow division among the local officials in Caen,[2] this withholding of supplies from the capital was not approved of by the adjacent departments and was rejected by the department of Seine Inférieure. Taken together with the arrest of the *députes en mission*, it had the effect of deterring the department of La Manche from committing itself to the revolt and of completely alienating Seine Inférieure.[3]

Nor was much progress effected during June in the way of active military preparations. An early recruiting manifesto addressed to the inhabitants of the Calvados seems, it is true, to have resulted in a respectable number of volunteers registering for service and, on the 19th, the society of *Carabots* volunteered practically *en bloc*.[4] This enabled a small first detachment of troops to leave Caen for Evreux—the concentration area against Paris—on 22 June, accompanied by four civil commissioners who had been appointed two days earlier.[5] When, however, on 27

[1] Pache naturally stressed the inhumanity of such economic pressure and compared its authors " aux brigands qui brûlent et ravagent les moissons, pour faire périr par la faim ceux qu'ils n'ont pu faire périr par le fer ". His letter dated 18 June is printed by Mancel in Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 201.

[2] The reply to Pache dated 21 June is in Vaultier, pp. 203-5.

[3] The department of the Calvados defended its action in arresting Romme and Prieur in a printed manifesto addressed to the inhabitants of La Manche on 12 June. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (52). Seine Inférieure's protest of 18 June only received a belated reply in the course of July. Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, pp. 192-200. The food embargo also seems to have been condemned by the proscribed Girondin leaders, and by the commune of Evreux. L. Dubreuil, " Evreux aux temps du fédéralisme ", *La Révolution Française*, lxxviii (1925), 260.

[4] Though this proclamation, dated 10 June, was a call to arms, it contained the statement that : " Dans cette sainte croisade, une goutte de sang de nos frères ne sera pas répandue ", Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (51). For the Carabot decision see Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, pp. 184-5.

[5] *Bulletin des Autoritées Constituées Réunies à Caen*, No. 1 (Renard reprint, 1875), British Museum. The four civil commissioners were Bougon-Longrais, Le Normand, Mesnil and L'Evêque.

June it was decided to raise two battalions—one from Caen and one from the rest of the department—this early enthusiasm had already evaporated.[1] This was partly due to lack of drive on the part of Wimpffen, who continued to resist requests that he should transfer his headquarters from Bayeux to Caen, and contented himself with provoking desertions from the republican forces in the area.[2] Volunteers were, however, also slow to present themselves because until early in July, no adequate provision was made for the financial support of the families they would leave behind.[3]

Even more discouraging was the news, at the end of June, that the adjacent departments of the Orne and the Eure had encountered opposition from their district and municipal authorities. Ever since the capture of Saumur on 6 June by the Vendéen rebels, the inhabitants of the Orne and the Sarthe departments had felt themselves threatened from the rear and, therefore, were reluctant to commit their scanty local means of self-defence to the project of a march on Paris. It seems doubtful, also, whether the Eure department, which was overrun by the secret agents of the Minister of the Interior and of the Executive Council, would have stayed in the insurrection, but for the arrival at Evreux of the advance guard of the Caen volunteers.[4]

This did not mean that federalism in the country as a whole was weak, since by June 1793 over sixty of the eighty odd departments had thrown off their allegiance to the central government and a score had announced their intention of raising departmental armies.[5] Moreover, all six of the Breton

[1] *Bulletin des Autoritées Constituées Réunies à Caen*, No. 3. Vaultier says that Wimpffen might have enrolled as many as 3,000 early in June, if he had so wished. *Souvenirs*, p. 56. One of Garat's " observers " in Caen reported, on 24 June, that of 1,500 who had originally volunteered, only 45 came forward later. P. Caron, *Rapports des agents du ministre de l'intérieur dans les départements* (1793-an II), (1951), ii. 309.

[2] Wimpffen brought over to the revolt some of his own troops of the army of Cherbourg—especially the Dragons de la Manche, the chasseurs commanded by de la Bretêche, and also the 6th Battalion (Calvados), who deserted in la Vendée.

[3] This financial provision was made on 3 July. MS. Régistre de l'Assemblée Centrale des autoritées constituées réunie en chef lieu du département du Calvados, fol. 3^{v}, Archives du Calvados.

[4] See A. Montier, " Le département de l'Eure et ses districts en Juin 1793 ", *La Révolution Française*, xxx (1896), 149 and 202-6.

[5] G. Pariset, *Histoire de France contemporaine, II : La révolution 1792-1799* (1920), p. 126.

departments had declared for the movement and were raising troops quickly.

The crucial stage of the insurrection in the north-west was now approaching and at the end of June Caen became the organizational centre of the whole rising. Three factors contributed to this result. Firstly, the central assembly of the local authorities in the city was given a broader basis of popular support by the election to it of deputies from the thirty-seven cantons of the department of the Calvados. In its new form the Calvados general assembly constituted itself on 1 July, electing as its president R. F. Chaix d'Est-Ange, curé of the parish of St. Stephen in Caen and vicar general of the constitutional bishop of the Calvados, and deputy Claude Fauchet.[1] Though some difficulty was encountered in completing its membership, the assembly imparted a new-found vigour to the mobilization of the department's military effort.[2] Secondly, under the resounding title of the Central Assembly of Resistance to Oppression, there was formed in Caen, on 30 June, a supreme insurrectional authority representative of all the departments of the north-west which had joined the rising.[3] This had happened as the result of the decision on 19 June of the six Breton departments to send two delegates each to Caen to concert action with the insurrectionary committee.[4] The assembly was presided over initially by J. B. Gaultier, deputy of the Côtes du Nord, and had as its secretary the ubiquitous Louis Caille.[5] Though neither the

[1] The proceedings of this assembly are recorded in a manuscript register in the departmental archives, Régistre de l'Assemblée Générale des autorités constituées réunie en chef lieu du département du Calvados. It does not seem to have been used before. This register is probably the most important single documentary source for the insurrection in Caen and the Calvados.

[2] It appears from a resolution of the assembly of 6 July that several of the cantons were slow to elect deputies. These were then publicly designated " partisans de l'Anarchie et de la désorganisation ". Deputies who were elected and refused to serve were to be similarly condemned, and, if holding public office, were to be deprived of their salaries. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (61).

[3] Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 212.

[4] MS. Extrait des déliberations de l'Assemblée Centrale séante à Rennes (L[m] Fédéralisme, Correspondance, arrêtés, Juin, Juillet et répression), Archives du Calvados. Loire Inférieure was not able to send any delegate to Caen immediately but decided to send one later.

[5] Early in July, Gaultier was superseded as President by L. J. Roujoux, of the Finistère department, and formerly deputy to the Legislative Assembly.

Orne nor the Eure departments sent delegates, the formation of this new Central Assembly of Resistance indicated that the insurrection in the north had taken on a federalist character, at least as regards its organization.

The third factor which increased Caen's importance in the rising was General Wimpffen's acceptance of the post of commander-in-chief of all the federalist armies in the north-west and the transference of his military headquarters to Caen in early July, at the specific request of the Central Assembly of the associated departments.[1] This assembly at once took a number of important political decisions. It openly repudiated the authority of the 'Rump' National Convention and proclaimed all its decrees carried on or since 27 May null and void.[2] All such decrees received from the Ministry of the Interior were not even acknowledged and were in fact suppressed.[3] At the request of the Central Assembly of Resistance, Louvet, one of the refugee Girondin deputies, published an inflammatory manifesto addressed to the country as a whole, justifying the insurrection and promising that the authors of the *coup d'etat* of 2 June would receive exemplary punishment.[4] The whole address was reminiscent of the Duke of Brunswick's more famous manifesto of 1792. Shortly afterwards the central assembly of the Calvados required all republican troops and all public officials within its jurisdiction, on pain of losing their salaries, to take the oath of resistance to oppression.[5] Nothing else remained except to

[1] The administrative council of the army of the Côtes de Cherbourg was moved to Caen on 7 July.

[2] The proclamation was printed by Mancel in Vaultier's, *Souvenirs*, p. 225. This action was justified by the Convention's alleged violation of articles 2 and 6 of the Declaration of the Rights of Man.

[3] Régistre de l'Assemblée Centrale—du Calvados, fol. 17, Archives du Calvados.

[4] This manifesto is sometimes, but incorrectly, attributed to Wimpffen. It was signed by L. J. Roujoux as President of the Assembly and by Louis Caille as Secretary. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (47). It received the approval of the Central Assembly of the Calvados on 5 July.

[5] MS. Register, fol. 5^{v} and fol. 7^{v}. Archives du Calvados. The form of the oath was: "Je jure de maintenir de tout mon pouvoir la Liberté, l'Egalité, de soutenir l'unité, l'indivisibilité de la République, de faire la guerre aux Tyrans et aux Anarchistes, et de ne mettre bas les armes que lorsque la Convention sera libre, et la France vengée des attentats commis contre la souveraineté du Peuple."

organize the Caen and Calvados battalions and to concentrate all the departmental forces as they arrived from Britanny, on Evreux, preparatory to their march on the capital. The first Breton detachment—that of Ille-et-Vilaine—arrived in Caen on 3 July and was duly fêted.[1] General Wimpffen then decided to mark the departure of the Caen battalion for the front on Sunday, 7 July by holding a review of his forces in order to stimulate recruiting. The story of that ill-fated parade is well known. Despite the martial show, speeches from the officials and personal appeals from the members of the insurrectionary assembly, only seventeen further volunteers enlisted.[2] It must have been a somewhat dispirited body of troops which moved off for Evreux the next day. Among the throng of spectators of the review was Charlotte Corday, who was so appalled at the poor response to the appeal for volunteers that she left Caen on 9 July intent on assassinating Marat.

While these leisurely preparations were going forward the central government had taken action. Immediately on the arrest of Romme and Prieur, the Convention had decreed the dismissal of all the public officials in Caen who had signed the arrest warrant.[3] Orders were at once sent to Wimpffen to liberate the deputies, and when he refused to do this, or to come to Paris to report on the state of the army of Cherbourg, he was relieved of his command on 26 June and all army formations were forbidden to take further orders from him.[4] All financial supplies to the departmental authorities were cut off by the Minister of the Interior.[5] Orders were hastily issued by the Ministry of War for the concentration of republican troops and detachments of the Parisian national guard on Mantes, just inside the western boundary of the Seine department and in the direct path of the rebels. To combat Girondin propaganda throughout the country and the manifestos and addresses now pouring from the printing presses at Caen, the Convention rushed through the final

[1] *Bulletin des Autorités Constituées Réunies à Caen*, No. 4.

[2] Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 22.

[3] *Moniteur* (Réimpression), xvi. 641. The decree was dated 13 June.

[4] *Moniteur*, xvi. 755-6.

[5] In accordance with a decree of 2 July 1793. Paré's papers. F[7] 4394, Archives Nationales.

stages of the new Jacobin constitution, adopted it on 24 June and submitted it to the consideration of all the primary assemblies.[1] This was meant to meet the demand of the insurgents for new republican institutions and to demonstrate the absurdity of their suggestions that these would include plans for a dictatorship exercised from Paris. Though the Central Assembly of Resistance condemned the new constitution as a political manoeuvre, and though its circulation was expressly forbidden by the Calvados authorities, copies were smuggled into Caen by the secret agents of the central government who were thus able to sow the seeds of disunity among the rebels.[2] Almost equally effective as a means of psychological warfare was a decree carried in the Convention on 26 June by Robert Lindet, deputy of the Eure department and member of the Committee of Public Safety. This summoned all local government officials who had connived at, or signed, resolutions tending to discredit the Convention or to incite to civil war to retract these resolutions and to send copies of their submission to the Committee of Public Safety in Paris. Three days' grace was, however, given for submissions to be made after the publication of the decree. In an address which was published simultaneously and widely circulated in Normandy, Lindet publicized the government's intention of pacifying and converting the rebels many of whom had been led astray by the Girondin leaders.[3] When Lindet himself and his colleague Duroy were named on 9 July as *représentants en mission* to the Eure department and given full powers to re-establish public order there, it soon became apparent that their policy towards the insurgents would indeed be not one of terror, but of pacification.[4]

On 12 July 1793 the Calvados battalion which had left Caen on the 8th arrived in Evreux and this induced the local commander of the federalist army, Count Joseph de Puisaye, to begin the march on Paris by moving on Vernon, then held by the advance guard of the Republican and Parisian forces.[5] On the

[1] F. A. Aulard, *Histoire politique de la Révolution Française* (1901), p. 309.

[2] See for example, P. Caron, *Rapports des agents du Ministre de l'intérieur dans les départements*, ii. 550.

[3] *Procès-verbal de la Convention Nationale*, xv. 332.

[4] A. Montier, *Robert Lindet* (1899), p. 117.

[5] For Puisaye's account of his operations before and after Brécourt see Vaultier's *Souvenirs*, pp. 236-46.

13th, after a hot day's march, the federalists, numbering about 2,000, had settled down for the night in the grounds of the Château de Brécourt, about half way between Pacy and Vernon. In the absence of their commander, who had gone off to spend the night at his own château in the vicinity, these troops, most of whom had drunk too copiously of the local cider, were surprised and attacked by the republican army. A few cannon shots from the Parisian army, which exploded harmlessly over their heads in the orchards, completely demoralized the federalists, who broke up in panic and retreated headlong. All attempts of Puisaye to rally his forces failed and the retreat became a rout. Evreux was abandoned and by 17 July the insurrectionists had fallen back as far as Lisieux, well inside the boundary of the Calvados.[1]

It is generally accepted among historians that this insignificant skirmish at Brécourt, followed by the precipitate retreat on Lisieux, virtually terminated the insurrection in the north-west. Nevertheless the rapid collapse of the rising is something which calls for explanation. One of Puisaye's reasons for falling back on Lisieux was to preserve his forces intact and to effect a junction with the Breton battalion from Finistère which had arrived in Caen too late to reach the concentration area in Evreux.[2] The Calvados battalion of 700 men recruited from the National Guards had also been instructed to concentrate at Lisieux on 18 July.[3] In consequence the federalists then numbered about 3,000. If Wimpffen had rallied these forces he might have counter-attacked. When the news of Brécourt reached Caen on the 16th no signs of weakness had been shown either by the Calvados local authorities or by the Central Assembly of the associated departments. Despite this, the insurrection collapsed

[1] Both sides subsequently accused the other of having fired the first shots, but it is established that the republicans began the action. The Genty collection in the Departmental Archives contains several contemporary accounts of the action at Brécourt in the letters of Lindet and Duroy to the Committee of Public Safety, the War Office and the President of the Convention. (Mission Lindet, correspondance.)

[2] The Finistère battalion had arrived in Caen on 13 July. It left for the field of operations on the 16th. *Bulletins des Autoritées Constituées Réunies à Caen*, Nos. 8 and 9. Vaultier's statement (*Souvenirs*, p. 58) that all three Breton contingents had arrived in Caen by the end of June is incorrect.

[3] Réintégration Genty (Mission Lindet), Archives du Calvados.

like a pack of cards. Ten days later all the local authorities in Caen had retracted, the Central Assembly of Resistance had withdrawn, the Girondin deputies and the Breton battalions had abandoned the city, the sections had demonstrated their willingness to accept the new Jacobin constitution, and the inhabitants were preparing to submit. How and why had this come about?

The explanation is to be found in the general disillusionment among the rank and file of the insurgents, the consequent distrust among the inhabitants of Caen of the political leadership of the local officials, the intrigues of the central government's secret agents inside the city, and the deteriorating food situation. The disillusionment showed itself first in the federalist army. The Norman levies had not expected to encounter any resistance on the march to the capital, since their leaders had persuaded them that their mission was to fraternize with and not to fight the Parisians.[1] Brécourt had, however, convinced them that, if the insurrection continued, it would involve civil war—and, moreover, on their own territory in the Calvados. This they were not prepared to face. Brécourt also produced a crop of desertions among the republican troops who had joined Wimpffen at the start of the rising, but who were now anxious to return to their allegiance to the government.[2] These desertions were assisted by a lavish expenditure of secret service funds by the republican commander General Sepher.[3] More serious, however, was the effect produced by the retreat on Lisieux on the Breton battalions. The Ille-et-Vilaine detachment had attempted to show fight at Brécourt, and had also attempted to stem the retreat at Pacy. The other Breton battalion had petitioned Puisaye to defend Evreux.[4] When consulted by Wimpffen at Lisieux on 17 July

[1] For Wimpffen's pacific manifesto to the inhabitants of Paris see Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, pp. 230-1.

[2] The chasseurs of the 16th mounted regiment formerly commanded by de la Bretêche were quick to desert once they knew that Bretêche was with the Parisian army.

[3] Lindet had pleaded for funds to be employed in this way in a letter to the Minister of War on 22 July 1793. Bouchotte replied on 23 July to say that he was sending Sepher 40,000 livres for this purpose. Genty MSS. (Mission Lindet correspondance), Archives du Calvados.

[4] Puisaye says, in his defence, that he had no knowledge of this petition till he reached Lisieux on 17 July. Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 245.

all the Bretons made it clear that by then they had lost all confidence in Puisaye and that they were not prepared to sacrifice themselves in the defence of Caen.[1]

Immediate negotiations with the commander of the Parisian forces and, if possible, with the central government were, therefore, imperative. Without waiting for his action to be approved by the Central Assembly of Resistance at Caen, Wimpffen sent a deputation, preceded by a herald, to parley with General Sepher on 19 July at Evreux. His object was to try and stop the " army of Pacification ", as it was now called, from advancing into the territory of the Calvados by persuading its commander that, if he did so, he would have to meet determined resistance. At the same time Wimpffen declared his willingness to come to an understanding. General Sepher, however, was not prepared to be bluffed, and after imprisoning and interrogating Wimpffen's messengers, dismissed them without an answer.[2] On the same day, the civil commissioners attached to the federalist forces at Lisieux got in touch with the agents of the Committee of Public Safety and expressed to the central government their desire for a peaceful accommodation. They explained their withdrawal into the Calvados by their determination to avoid civil war, by their wish to spare the local harvests, and to disprove the allegation of their complicity with the Vendéen rebels.[3]

Meanwhile, disillusionment was gaining ground rapidly in Caen. Early consternation among the citizens at the news of Brécourt, it is true, had been partially allayed by official reassurances and the suggestion of the local newspaper that the federalists had only sustained a slight and temporary setback.[4] Anxiety, however, soon returned at the news that Wimpffen's overtures at Evreux had been unsuccessful and that the federalist forces at Lisieux were disintegrating. The first overt signs of a disposition to abandon the insurrection came from the society of *Carabots*, whose president Barbot appears to have accompanied the

[1] Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 26.

[2] Lindet to Committee of Public Safety, 21 July 1793. Genty Collection (Mission Lindet, Correspondance), Archives du Calvados.

[3] Copy of letter from agents of Committee of Public Safety, dated 21 July from Lisieux. Ibid.

[4] *Affiches du Calvados.*

messengers to General Sepher at Evreux, and who, therefore, knew of Wimpffen's manoeuvres.[1] Between 19 and 22 July a split occurred in the society. One group, led by the officials, announced the intention of accepting the new Jacobin constitution and tore out of its register the resolutions which had committed its members to the revolt. Although the opposing faction did its best to reverse this decision, and to expel the dissidents, it was too late.[2] The movement inside the city for the acceptance of the constitution was encouraged by the officials of the commune and by 25 July a majority of the sections had declared their intention of doing so. Some of the sections then showed their distrust of the local authorities by withdrawing the powers of their delegates to the Central Assembly of the Calvados.[3]

Feeling their increasing isolation, the local officials in Caen began, in turn, to secede from the insurrection. The first to submit was the general assembly of the district. Without consulting its *procureur syndic* Louis Caille, and without informing their colleagues of the municipal administration, the district assembly sent in its retraction to the central government.[4] On 21 July the general council of the commune decided to follow this example and its formal retraction took place on the 24th.[5] Secret agents of the government were then at work inside the city, weakening the remaining resistance in the sections, distributing copies of the constitution, provoking desertions among Wimpffen's staff officers, and stirring up popular discontent at the deepening food crisis.[6] For a time the Central Assembly of the Calvados defeated recurrent attempts by the municipal and district

[1] Lindet to Committee of Public Safety, 21 July 1793. Genty Collection (Mission Lindet, Correspondance).

[2] Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, p. 141. For the protest of the group which wished to continue in the insurrection see ibid. pp. 141-4.

[3] MS. Régistre de l'Assemblée Centrale des autorités constituées réunie en chef lieu du département du Calvados, 22 July 1793, fol. 38^{v}.

[4] Ibid. The mayor was interrogated on this action on 25 July.

[5] MS. Régistre des délibérations du Corps Municipal et du Conseil général de la Commune de Caen (4 January 1792—11 germinal an II), fols. 160-2, Archives Municipales (Caen), Série D* 2.

[6] See report of Bottu to Faypoult, chef de division au Ministère de l'Intérieur, 17 July 1793, P. Caron, *Rapports des agents du Ministre de l'Intérieur dans les départements*, ii. 548-51.

authorities to pave the way for a general submission.[1] On 22 and 23 July, however, its sessions were invaded by mobs of women, carrying empty sacks and clamouring for flour.[2] Undeterred by this, the assembly resolved on the 24th that the city should be declared in a state of siege, and that Wimpffen should be ordered to use every available means of conducting " a just and reasonable defence ".[3] This eleventh hour decision had to be abandoned, when on the same day the Central Assembly of Resistance decided to leave Caen for Rennes and when, on the 25th, the department of the Calvados itself retracted.[4] When the Breton battalions moved off westwards, accompanied by the Girondin deputies disguised in uniforms, when Wimpffen himself fled into hiding, Caen was defenceless. The way was then clear for the release of Romme and Prieur from captivity, and for the final negotiations between the municipal officials and Robert Lindet for the submission.[5] The republican forces entered the city on 2 August, followed by the *représentants en mission* on the following day.

The federalist insurrection in the department of the Calvados had thus come to an inglorious end. It may perhaps be wondered what the real political objects of the insurgents were and what changes they would have proposed in the structure of the central government, if they had been successful. When in the

[1] Régistre de l'Assemblée Générale des autorités Constituées Réunie en chef lieu du département du Calvados. A motion for the release of Romme and Prieur on 21 July was adjourned, as was also one that Burcy, president of the Section du Civisme, should be asked to explore ways and means of pacification.

[2] Ibid. 22 and 23 July. The assembly ordered the release of 125 sacks of grain and also of flour to the municipality for immediate distribution. It appears from a letter from Lindet and Duroy to the Committee of Public Safety of 10 August 1793, that these food riots had been provoked by Comte, a government agent. Aulard, *Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, v. 523-5.

[3] Régistre de l'Assemblée Générale des autorités constituées, Calvados, 24 July.

[4] See manuscript extract, from the Régistre des délibérations de l'Assemblée Générale des départments réunies à Caen, 24 July 1793. Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (39). The departmental authorities explained their motives in retracting in a letter to their constituents on 26 July. Genty Collection (Mission Lindet, Insurrection Fédéraliste).

[5] Lindet had written to the municipal officials, disregarding the departmental authority, on 28 July. Genty Collection (Mission Lindet, Correspondance), Archives du Calvados.

autumn of 1793 the Committee of General Security of the Convention investigated the origins and character of the federalist movement, it concluded, from the evidence at its disposal, that the ultimate consequence of its success would have been the establishment in France of a system of federal republics on the Swiss model with a national Senate and regional military commanders.[1] This is what the term federalism implied, but in Jacobin usage " federalist " was a term of abuse meant to suggest that the rebels would have undermined national unity and compromised the chances of defeating the foreign coalition. An allied accusation was that the " federalists ", and particularly those of the north-west were in league with the royalist counter-revolution in La Vendée, and that their public professions of republicanism were all the more insidious on that account.[2]

The first of these charges was anticipated and repudiated by the Norman federalists at the outset of the revolt. Both accusations were rejected when the revolt was collapsing and subsequently, when those who had been compromised wished to exculpate themselves. They then appealed, as evidence of their intentions, to their public resolutions and manifestos. These had always proclaimed the principle of " the unity and individibility of the republic ". The insurgents also insisted that their disillusionment had really sprung from their tardy recognition that a few crypto-royalists, such as Wimpffen and Puisaye, had been using the movement for their own ulterior purposes. What had been proposed, in the raising of departmental forces to march on Paris was not to dissolve the National Convention, but to ensure its sovereign independence and to protect private property against the anarchists of the Paris commune. The essence of their defence was that they had been misled and deceived by the Girondin faction in the Convention and by covert royalist sympathizers.[3]

[1] J. Julien (de Toulouse), *Rapport fait au nom du comité de surveillance et de Sûreté-Générale sur les administrations rebelles* (15 October 1793), p. 189. British Museum, Croker Collection. [2] Ibid. p. 49.

[3] See *Précis des causes de l'insurrection du département du Calvados et de la ville de Caen en particulier*. Probably published in October 1793. Printed by Mancel in Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, pp. 250-6. This gives a summary of the various arguments used in the various retractions made in July.

It is not easy for the historian to disentangle from these accusations and pleas the elements of truth and falsehood. None of the leaders of the revolt was ever brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal and only a few local officials were imprisoned and interrogated on the spot.[1] There is, therefore, not much judicial evidence against them. On the other hand, neither their public manifestos, nor their subsequent pleas in self-defence can be accepted at their face value. The only contemporary record evidence on the political objectives of the federalists of the north-west which I have been able, so far, to trace consists of the instructions drawn up by the Central Assembly of the Breton departments at Rennes in June 1793 to guide their delegates when they joined the insurrectionary committee at Caen. These resolutions were modified in consultation with the Norman federalists and, in their final form, give a clear picture of the immediate political aims of the whole movement.[2]

Apart from the release of the Girondin deputies, and the reversal of the political results of 2 June 1793, the insurgents wished to provide for the independence and freedom of action of the National Convention, for the reduction of the political and administrative powers of the Paris commune and, finally, for the abolition of the main features of revolutionary government as it had been functioning since March 1793. The main demand was still for a departmental guard for the protection of the Convention, to which Paris itself should contribute a contingent. Once the Convention had been freed from the interference of the spectators in the galleries and from the demonstrations of armed petitioners, it was to be called on to restrict its activities to purely legislative functions and to draft a new constitution within two months. Only if it still felt that political differences in its midst were too deep for it to function properly was it to arrange for its own

[1] Robert Lindet refused on his entry to Caen to make the conviction of individuals denounced by the republican secret agents his main concern. His policy was to pacify the general population. Several of the local officials were able to slip away into hiding.

[2] Printed *Projet d'Arrêté, L'Assemblée extraordinaire des députés des Départements, etc. séante à Rennes* (with corrections made at Caen), Archives Municipales (Caen), I, 36 (68), dated 19-22 June 1793.

dissolution and the formation of a new assembly.[1] The commune of Paris was to be purged, its finances were no longer to be subsidized from the national Treasury and its sections were not to continue to meet in daily sessions. Instead of a single despotic commune, there were to be as many communes in Paris as there were judicial courts. Finally, the Revolutionary Tribunal was to be abolished, the powers of the Executive Council of Ministers were to be expanded at the expense of the Committee of Public Safety and the dreaded *représentants en mission* recalled.[2] There was no hint here of " federalism " in the Jacobin sense and nothing that could be fairly termed " counter-revolutionary ". Only two comments seem to be called for—first that there was no recognition in this document of the overriding needs of centralization for the purpose of national defence and, second, that, ironically, some of the measures here advocated against the Commune of Paris and its sections were later adopted by the Jacobin Committee of Public Safety in the autumn and winter of 1793 ![3]

There is one last aspect of the insurrection which needs to be mentioned and perhaps further studied and that is the influence exerted on its tactics and strategy and on its final outcome by the food scarcity. There is ample evidence that throughout the rising the local authorities in Caen had been preoccupied by the shortage of bread and flour in the city. One or two examples of this will suffice. We have seen how the municipal authorities in Caen had tried to prevent the church bells being rung on the night of the original revolt because of the danger of panic in the country districts and the threat to the city's corn supplies.[4] One

[1] It is true, however, that the Breton delegates were sent to Caen to concert measures so as to fulfil " the law of 24 May "—a reference to the resolution of the department of the Jura—calling on the summons to Bourges of the *députés suppléants* of the Convention.

[2] Strict supervision of the Jacobin and Cordélier clubs was also recommended. Their titles were to be changed and their papers placed under seal.

[3] On 9 September 1793 a decree of the Convention limited the meetings of the Parisian sections to two a week. The decree of 4 December 1793 on " Revolutionary Government " restricted the Commune's control over the " *comités révolutionnaires* ". J. M. Thompson, *French Revolution, Documents, 1789-1794* (1933), p. 265.

[4] p. 319 above.

of the reasons for the arrest of Romme and Prieur on 10 June was that they had callously refused to assist the town officials in solving their food problems.[1] Concern for the protection of the local harvests from the ravages of civil war had also partly motivated the decision to retreat after Brécourt and the final determination of the department to retract.[2] Secret government agents had precipitated the food riots in the Central Assembly of the Calvados authorities on 22 and 23 July and had thus done much to undermine the resolution of the only authority that had seriously contemplated resistance.[3]

At the higher level of policy, one of the noticeable features of the local administration in Caen during this revolt was the steady support given to the governmental control of corn prices.[4] This suited the town authorities in two ways. It helped, in the short run, to prevent the price of bread rising too sharply in the crucial period immediately before the harvest, and by antagonizing the cultivators in the country districts it evoked hostility to the central government among the peasants, who could not be expected to understand the larger political issues.[5] Similarly the attempt to deprive Paris of the primary foodstuffs of Normandy must be regarded, not entirely as an aggressive measure of blockade, but also as an attempt to solve the local food shortage in Caen. Among the considerations which led to the adoption of this measure was the conviction that it was retaliatory action, justified by the partiality of the Minister of the Interior in withholding from Caen its proper share of imported wheat held in storage at Le Havre. These supplies had been, it was alleged, diverted to Paris. Part of the local feeling against the commune

[1] See report of Perrin de Sainte-Emmelie to Garat, 11 June 1793. P. Caron, *Rapports des agents du ministre de l'intérieur dans les départements*, ii. 304-5.

[2] Manuscript letter of Departmental officials to constituents, 26 July 1793. Genty Collection (Mission Lindet, Insurrection fédéraliste), Archives du Calvados.

[3] Aulard, *Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, v. 523-5.

[4] It was lucky for the insurrections that the date of the decree was 4 May 1793, and they could, therefore, observe it without sacrificing their principles. The question came up in the Central Assembly of the Calvados on 6 July. Régistre, fol. 11, Archives du Calvados.

[5] L. J. Francqueville to Garat, 17 May 1793—describing the peasants—says " Ils sont d'une ignorance qui fait pitié ". Caron, i. 392.

of Paris was that it had been subsidized unfairly from the national revenue in order that the price of bread in the capital could be maintained at a lower level than in the provinces.[1]

Unfortunately for the insurgents, however, neither of these policies—the implementation of the corn maximum and the restriction of the food supplies of the capital—worked out to their advantage. The reaction of the peasants in the Calvados, as elsewhere in France, to the regulation of corn prices was to withhold their supplies from the local markets, with the result that the food scarcity inside Caen became acute precisely at the moment when the disaster at Brécourt had dissipated the federalists' military resources. Ironically, too, just as the blockade of the capital was causing the mayor of Paris, Pache, the gravest concern, the local authorities at Caen lifted the embargo on 13 July, mainly out of concern for one or two Parisian sections which had expressed sympathy for the federalists, by sending delegates both to Evreux and Caen.[2]

As my conclusion I should like to quote an unpublished letter in the departmental archives at Caen from Pache to Robert Lindet and Duroy, the *représentants en mission* attached to the republican army in the Eure and Calvados departments. It is undated but it was most probably written between 9 and 15 July 1793. It is headed *For your private information only*. It reads as follows :

Citizen deputies, it is my duty once again to recall to your attention my grave concern at the food situation in Paris. For some time past the bakers have not been able to purchase any commercial supplies and the municipal granaries are providing the Central Market on alternate days with 1,200 and 1,500 sacks of flour, weighing 125 lbs. It is impossible for this service to be maintained for long, and I see the granaries being emptied with an alarming rapidity.

Be good enough, therefore, citizen deputies, to open up road communications as quickly as possible and ensure the provisioning of Paris, whatever the means. I need not remind you of all the major considerations which have made you envisage in a famine at Paris the overthrow of the republic. I confine myself to saying that a famine will be at our doors if you do not expedite the opening of

[1] See reply of departmental authorities to Pache, 21 June 1793. Vaultier, *Souvenirs*, pp. 203-5.

[2] Régistre de l'Assemblée Centrale des autorités constituées du Calvados, fol. 27v. The delegates of the Finistère Section had fraternized with the Calvados forces at Evreux. For federalist opinion among the Paris sections at this time see A. Soboul, *Les Sans-Culottes Parisiens en l'an II* (1958), pp. 79-88.

communications and facilitate the purchase of supplies, and even so it is already a late hour for this to be done. I cannot enter on any details in this connection, but believe one who is incapable of giving way to any feelings of panic and whose demands, now and in the past, have only risen from a persuasion of absolute need and save the fatherland. Greetings and fraternity. Pache.

The postscript follows :

Allow me one further observation. There are some royalists or aristocrats, whom the knowledge of our distress would induce to hold out, since we can only maintain the struggle for a short time ; there are some Republicans who, without this knowledge and believing us better provided than we are, would be in no haste to send us supplies. I leave it to your judgement to make whatever overtures on this subject seem to you most appropriate to the persons and passions involved ; but I beg of you once more, obtain for us quick assistance.[1]

Obviously the situation was serious, and the *bataille sans larmes* at Brécourt seems not only to have destroyed Norman federalism, but also to have helped to save Paris from near starvation.

APPENDIX

Pache to Lindet and Duroy (undated, but probably shortly after 13 July 1793).

Pour vous seuls

Citoyens Députés,

Je dois vous renouveller encore toute ma sollicitude sur l'état de Paris, relativement aux subsistances. Les Boulangers ne tirent rien du Commerce depuis longtemps et les magazins de la Municipalité fournissent par jour à la Halle alternativement 12 et 1500 sacs de farine du poids de 125 ll. Il n'est pas possible qu'un tel service, puisse se soutenir longtemps, et je vois les magazins se vider avec une rapidite effrayante.

Veuillez, donc, Citoyens Députés, ouvrir le plus promptement possible la circulation et assurer l'approvisionnement de Paris de quelque manière que ce soit. Je ne vous rapelle point toutes les considérations majeurs, qui vous ont fait voir dans une famine à Paris, le renversement de la république. Je me borne à vous dire qu'elle s'approche, si vous n'accélerez l'ouverture des routes et la facilité des achats, et encore est-il déjà bien tard. Je ne peux entrer dans aucun détail à ce sujet, mais croyez un homme incapable de se livrer à une terreur panique qui n'a demandé et qui ne demande que par le sentiment du besoin, et sauvez la patrie.

[1] Genty Collection (Mission Lindet, Correspondance), Archives du Calvados. For French text see Appendix.

Salut et frat. Pache.

Permettez moi encore une observation : il est tel Royalistes ou aristocrats à qui la connaissance de notre détresse inspirerait l'idée de tenir ferme, puisque nous ne pouvons soutenir la lutte que peu de temps ; il est tel Républicain qui, sans cette connaissance, et nous croyant mieux pourvus que nous ne sommes, ne s'empresserait point de nous fournir. C'est à votre prudence qu'il est remis de faire à ce sujet des ouvertures selon les hommes et leurs passions ; mais je vous en supplie encore. Procurez nous de prompts secours.

THE WYCLIFITE *PATER NOSTER* and *TEN COMMANDMENTS*, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ENGLISH MSS. 85 AND 90 IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

By A. L. KELLOGG, Ph.D.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW JERSEY
AND
ERNEST W. TALBERT, M.A., Ph.D.
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE following essay is an attempt to relate Rylands English MSS. 85 and 90 to the background of Wyclifite commentary by which both were strongly influenced. Section I of the essay will discuss the development of English manuals of religious instruction, and Section II the alterations carried out upon these compilations by the Wyclifite commentator. Sections III and IV will deal with the *Pater Noster* and *Ten Commandments* as perhaps the most notable examples of the confusions wrought by the process of Wyclifite revision. These sections will offer tentative catalogues, respectively of the *Pater Noster* and *Ten Commandments*, and will endeavour to indicate the positions of Rylands English MSS. 85 and 90 in the developing tradition of the Wyclifite commentary. Section V will present for the first time an edition of the highly interesting *Ten Commandments* of Rylands English MS. 85, and Section VI will be devoted to some concluding remarks.

I. The English Manual of Religious Instruction

The ultimate source of the kind of literature to be discussed in the present essay is the Lateran Council of 1215.[1] The importance there accorded the cure of souls placed before the

[1] Here and in the following discussion we are indebted to the excellent essay by the Rev. L. E. Boyle, O.P., S.T.L., "The *Oculus Sacerdotis* and Some Other Works of William of Pagula," *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., v (1955), 81-110.

Church a clearly defined educational duty. It must produce within the clergy as a whole a level of doctrinal knowledge adequate to the instruction of the laity in the basic principles of the Christian faith. However. during the years which followed the Lateran Council the English Church met this need only with varying diocesan legislation, and it was not until the Council of Lambeth in 1281 that a programme of general scope and effectiveness was introduced. This programme was set forth in the famous *Ignorantia Sacerdotum* [1] of Archbishop Pecham, at once a powerful indictment of the learning of the clergy and a clear statement of the level of competence the clergy was to be required to maintain. Four times a year, each priest entrusted with the cure of souls was to preach to his parishioners "vulgariter, absque cujuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica", the essentials of the Christian faith. These essentials were the Articles of the Faith, the Commandments of the Old and New Testaments, the Seven Works of Mercy, the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Principal Virtues, and the Seven Sacraments. Shortly after the middle of the fourteenth century, this summary of doctrine became authoritative in the Province of York as well as in that of Canterbury. In 1357 John de Thoresby, Archbishop of York, reaffirmed almost verbatim in his own Ordinances the provisions of the Lambeth Constitutions noted above. Henceforth there was imposed upon the laity of both provinces a common duty of learning and upon the clergy a common duty of instruction.

As might be expected, much of the literature designed to furnish the parish priest with the knowledge demanded of him by archiepiscopal legislation was in Latin. The first and most notable effort in this genre was the *Oculus Sacerdotis* (c. 1320) of William of Pagula,[2] himself, appropriately enough, a parish priest of Berkshire. The excellence of this work is made clear by the number of imitations which followed it: the *Cilium Oculi Sacerdotis* (1330-40), the *Regimen Animarum* (1343), and the

[1] David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (London, 1737), ii. 54-6. The relevant chapter of the *Lambeth Constitutions* is also accessible in *Lay Folks Catechism*, ed. T. F. Simmons and H. E. Nolloth, EETS. OS. 118. 3 ff. We follow Father Boyle in referring to the chapter by its *incipit*.

[2] See Boyle, op. cit. p. 83. This is, of course, not to say there were no manuals anteceding Pagula and the Pecham Constitutions. See Boyle, p. 93.

Pupilla Oculi of John de Burgh (1384). However, even though this same sort of Latin manual continued to appear during the course of the fifteenth century,[1] the impulse to explain "vulgariter et absque subtilitate".[2] was being felt as early as the fourteenth. The Latin *Speculum Christiani* (*c.* 1360-80), likewise based on the Lambeth Constitutions, contains English verse and an English sermon; a single manuscript, dating from the fifteenth century, is entirely in English.[3] William of Wadington wrote his *Manuel des Pechiez* in Anglo-Norman, but by the early years of the fourteenth century it had become the *Handlyng Synne* of Robert of Brunne.[4] In 1279, two years before the Council of Lambeth, Frère Lorens composed his immensely popular *Somme le Roi*, which appeared in England in the fourteenth century as the *Azenbite of Inwit* and the *Book of Vices and Virtues*, and again in the fifteenth century as Caxton's *Royal Book*.[5] Perhaps the best example of the power of this movement is to be found in Chaucer's "Parson's Tale", where just such a vernacular manual is accorded the honour of knitting up the "greet mateere" of the *Canterbury Tales*.

During the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the development discussed above is marked by two opposing tendencies. The first is to cover a vast number of topics in "schort wordes". Aside from the simplicity and clarity urged

[1] H. G. Pfander, "Some Medieval Manuals of Religious Instruction in England," *JEGP*, xxxv (1936), 246.

[2] The *Regimen Animarum*'s paraphrase of Archbishop Pecham's phrase. See B.M. Harley MS. 2272, fol. 88r.

[3] Ed. Gustaf Holmstedt, EETS. OS. 182. The single English translation is to be found in B.M. Harley MS. 6580. Since Holmstedt (p. xxxvi) does not believe this to be an original, there is very little basis on which to proceed in arriving at a date for the actual translation. Holmstedt's conclusions as to authorship, that the author of the original version was a Franciscan and the translator of the English a Lollard (pp. clxxix-clxxx), seem to have been arrived at in the absence of substantial evidence.

[4] See J. E. Wells, *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (New Haven, 1916), p. 342. D. W. Robertson, however, considers it a confessional rather than a general manual (*Speculum*, xxii (1947), 162-190).

[5] The translations cited are simply the most notable. W. N. Francis in his edition of the *Book of the Vices and Virtues* (EETS. OS. 217) points out the existence of eight translations of the *Somme le Roi* other than the *Book of Vices and Virtues* (op. cit. p. xxxii).

by the *Ignorancia Sacerdotum*, a sufficient reason for this tendency seems to have been the vast and growing list of items to be covered. One finds joined to the basic Pecham-Thoresby topics a considerable list of miscellaneous additions : the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Seven Virtues opposed to the Seven Deadly Sins, the Five Bodily Wits, the Five Ghostly Wits, the Pater Noster, Ave Maria and Creed. These last three—Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Creed—in fact constitute a separate group and are from the beginning of the thirteenth century found as a unit, usually in poetry, but sometimes in prose, or in a combination of prose and poetry.[1] It seems likely that during the course of the thirteenth century, the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Creed associated themselves with other standard devotional topics—the Ten Commandments, the Seven Deadly Sins, Seven Works of Mercy and thus formed a further grouping.[2] In any case, after the promulgation of the Lambeth Constitutions, the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Creed joined with the Pecham list to form an expanded grouping ;[3] and this grouping finally expanded again to include later accretions, such as the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Five Bodily Wits, Five Ghostly Wits, etc. It is probably not worth-while to multiply examples of this sort of collection, but one is certainly worth citing, if only as a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole " schort wordes " approach.

[1] Cf. Lambeth 487, fol. 21^{v} [Pater Noster BR 2709], fol. 25^{v} [prose Creed] (*c.* 1200) ; Arundel 292, fol. 3^{r} [Creed BR 1326], fol. 3^{r} [Pater Noster BR 787], fol. 3^{v} [Ave Maria BR 2100] (13th cent.) ; Cotton Cleopatra B 6, fol. 204^{v} [Pater Noster BR 2706], fol. 204^{v} [Ave Maria BR 1062] ; fol. 204^{v} [prose Creed] (13th cent.) ; Caius Coll., Camb. 52, fol. 43^{r} [prose Creed, Pater Noster, Ave] (13th-14th cent.). The abbreviation " BR " is used to refer to the *Index of Middle English Verse*, ed. Carleton Brown and R. H. Robbins (New York : Columbia Univ. Press, 1943).

[2] See Emanuel Coll., Camb. 27, fol. 162^{r} (late 13th cent.) where this exact grouping is found. The occurrence of the Ten Commandments, Seven Deadly Sins, and Seven Works of Mercy in this manuscript may reflect the influence of the *Ignorancia Sacerdotum*, but the time interval makes this seem rather improbable. It is more likely that the two groupings, both popular, became associated during the thirteenth century at a time antecedent to the publication of the Lambeth Constitutions.

[3] Bodl. 2298 (Bodley 549 , fol. 77^{v} [early 15th cent.]), and Bodl. 13679 (Rawl. D 913), fol. 10^{r} [15th cent.] offer examples of the Pater Noster and Creed linked to the whole of the Pecham list, with the single exception of the Fourteen Articles.

This is the magnificently titled *Tabula Compendiosa de Fide Christiana*,[1] which in two folios and no particular order contains virtually every topic mentioned above: the Seven Virtues, the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Virtues opposed to the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Acts of Bodily Mercy, the Seven Acts of Ghostly Mercy, the Seven Sacraments, the Seven Petitions of the Pater Noster, the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Two Principal Commandments, the Ten Commandments, and the Five Bodily Wits.

Opposed to this tendency toward inclusiveness at all costs was a second and equally vigorous tendency. This was to provide, in English, commentaries as full and informative as those contained in the Latin manuals. The *Ayenbite of Inwit* and the *Book of the Vices and Virtues*, both drawn—as noted above—from the Dominican Frère Lorens and through him related to the great *Summae* of Pennaforte and Peraldus, are both excellent examples of this tendency. However, for purposes of the present essay, these well-known works are of considerably less interest than more obscure compilations with which the Wyclifite adapter seems to have felt more at ease. Such compilations, examples of which will be discussed in detail below, usually contain tractates on the Pater Noster, Creed, Ten Commandments, Vices, and Virtues. As such they appear in subject matter to be quite similar to the *Tabula Compendiosa*, noted above, or indeed to the *Ayenbite* itself. There are, however, important differences. Unlike the compendious collections, the commentaries in question were works of at least some size. As such they were capable of absorbing without undue disturbance the infusion of opinions, which, if stated baldly and alone, would have immediately appeared shocking or heretical. They were also, when revised, capable of serving as preaching handbooks for "treue prestis". Unlike the established works, these commentaries were, with a few striking exceptions, little enough known to permit unobtrusive alterations. The following section will discuss a few representative commentaries and the changes they underwent at the hands of the Wyclifite adapter.

[1] B.M. Add. 10106, fols. 40r-40v (15th cent.). For other similarly expanded treatments, see Bodl. 3054 (Bodley 938), and Bodl. 10027 (Tanner 201).

II. The Wyclifite Method

The appeal of the mother tongue was for Wyclif unlimited. His insistence upon preaching, his plan for the translation of the Bible, all testify to his faith in the power of the vernacular.[1] The existence therefore of English commentaries on basic doctrine must have seemed to him and his followers an opportunity not easily ignored. If the "Ten Commandments" published by Thomas Arnold in his *Select English Works of John Wyclif*[2] is, as it is generally taken to be, both genuine Wyclif and an early work, it would appear that the master himself showed the way. In any case, the technique, whether practised by master or disciple, is relatively uniform. Let us consider an example. British Museum Royal MS. XVII A 26, a fifteenth-century collection of religious tracts in English, has often been connected with the name of Wyclif and has even been displayed in a Wyclif exhibition.[3] A reading of the manuscript, however, shows it to be singularly devoid of Wyclifite sentiments. The truth of the matter would seem to be that in Royal MS. XVII A 26 we have not a Wyclifite manuscript, but a most interesting example of the kind of manuscript on which the Wyclifite commentator delighted to operate. For instance, at fols. 22^{r}-26^{v} of this manuscript is found a brief treatise, outspoken but certainly not heretical, on the Seven Deadly Sins. If this short tractate is compared with the vast and discursive *Seven Deadly Sins* (c. 1385) once attributed to Wyclif but now more usually to Nicholas Hereford,[4] a quite definite pattern emerges. Hereford, or whoever the adapter was, begins each section of his own commentary with a word by word transcription of his original. If the material encountered fails to impinge upon any

[1] See H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif* (Oxford, 1926), ii. 201 ff.; ii. 149 ff. Hereafter referred to as "Workman".

[2] Oxford, 1869-71; iii. 82-92. Hereafter referred to as "Arnold".

[3] E. M. Thompson, *Wycliffe Exhibition* (London, 1884), p. 52.

[4] Edmund D. Jones was the first to make this attribution. See *Anglia*, xxx (1907), 267-8. He is followed in this by Workman, i. 330; ii. 135; and H. E. Winn, *Wyclif: Select English Writings* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 146-7. Workman assigns the *Seven Deadly Sins* to about the year of Hereford's return from Rome (1385). Cf. *John Wyclif*, ii. 135, and Winn, *Wyclif*, p. 147.

of Hereford's prepared responses, he continues to the end of the section in his original and then proceeds to add comment of his own. Thus, in his treatment of Pride, he reproduces, virtually word for word, all of the commentary to be found on fols. 22r-23r of Royal MS. XVII A 26, and then adds a brief but uninspired diatribe on the " falshed of prelatis and prestis ".[1] If, on the other hand, the material found in his original [2] touches upon a favourite doctrinal theme, he extemporizes vigorously until his ingenuity is exhausted, and then returns meekly to his source. An example of this is to be found in Hereford's treatment of the sin of Gluttony. For purposes of comparison, the entire passage as contained in Royal MS. XVII A 26, fols. 25r-25v is reproduced below :

The sixte synne of þese seuene is clepid glotenye : and it falliþ to þe fleisch / but boþe þe fend *and* þe world tempten man to þis synne / for bi fallyng in to þis synne. þei han a man li3tli to her propre synne bi cause of her temptynge. for glotenye falliþ þanne to man / whanne he takiþ mete or drynke more þan profitiþ to his soule / but certis *it mai falle to man þat he synneþ in abstynence : as whanne he fediþ not his bodi þat schulde bere hym to serue his soule* / and upon fyue maneris men synnen in excess of etynge *and* drynkyng / and comynli clerkis first / Whanne a man etiþ or drynkiþ bifore þe tyme þat resoun schulde axe. as glotouns of drynke wolen drynke in þe morewe / and þat as þei seien askiþ drunkenesse ouer euene / sum man to hastili etiþ *and* drynkiþ / *and* þat is a3enus fisik *and* doiþ harm to his bodi / and sum man to tendirli norischen her bodies. *and* spenden goddis goodis in to costli metis and drynkis in glotenye / and sum men to lustfuli etiþ *and* drynkiþ: *and* þat distemperiþ a man in bodi *and* soule / and sum men taken hem a tyme to

[1] Cf. Arnold, iii. 122.

[2] The authors do not maintain that the tract in Royal XVII A 26 is necessarily the source of Hereford's *Seven Deadly Sins*, but the correspondences are so exact that the actual source must have been something very close indeed to the tractate found in Royal XVII A 26.

ete sauereli / *and* ai þe more þat þei wasten :
þe betere be þei paied / ȝhe þei holden it a
boost to ete myche or drynke / *and god woot*
wher proude clerkis and religiouse men and
riche and proude men of þis world synnen
in þis maner of glotenye / as listi men in
delicat metis and drynkis and myspenden
goddis goodis in þis synne / *and* also laboreris
ben smytid wiþ þis glotenye. and speciali
in drunknesse on þe halidai / and þus þei
leesen her wit *and* ben maid lik to. vn-
resonable beestis / *but beestis mesuren hem*
betere in etynge and drynkynge þan þei doon /
and so þei Vnablen hem to serue god on
halidai and to worschipe hym as þei schulden /
and many oþer synnes comen of þis drunkenesse :
as fyȝting bacbityng and mansleynge / *and þertfor*
siche men schulden mesure hem in etynge and
algatis in drynkynge on þe halidai. and take
sum on þe werk dai whanne þei trauelen : and
not spende al on þe halidai in sich glotenye /

If one examines this passage side by side with the *Seven Deadly Sins* printed by Arnold, Hereford's procedure becomes apparent. He begins exactly as in his source " þo sixte synne " [1] and follows it almost word for word until the conclusion of the first italicized passage (line 9-12), at which point he digresses for some 500 words on the abuses of abstinence.[2] He then returns to his text at the precise point at which he left it " upon fyue maneris " (line 12),[3] follows it verbatim until he reaches the second italicized passage (lines 28-31), where he finds clerks and others attacked for their excessive passion for food and drink. This is material precisely to his taste, for it provides an opportunity for an eloquent indictment of the gluttony of the religious, particularly monks. In Arnold's text the passage reads :

And God wot whether proude clerkes synnen in þese maners ; ȝe, religiouse men, as mounkes or freris, wasten more meete or drinke þen profitis to hom. Ffor, as mony men seyn, monkes haf grete kuppes, and purchascen pardoun to men þat

[1] Arnold, iii. 155 (CAP. XXV).

[2] Ibid. 155-156. The digression runs from 155, thirteen lines from bottom, to 156, four lines from bottom. It is interesting that Hereford alters " bodi " to " horse " and states his material in terms of a knight metaphor. See n. 3, p. 353 below and Arnold, iii. 130.

[3] Ibid. 156 (four lines from bottom of page).

drinken depe of hom, and in hor bred and hor drinke asken þei a mesure, and stryven for defaute þerof more þen defaute of virtues. As þei asken noumbre and grettenesse of eyren, so þei asken largenesse of flesche and of fische ; and þus þei harmen homself in mortheryng of meete.[1]

Hereford's original, with its reference to " clerkis and religiouse men and . . . men of þis world " (lines 29-30), also happily provides him with the main elements of the Wyclifite scheme he has sporadically been pursuing, that of the three estates of the Church : preachers, defenders, and labourers.[2] Thus, having disposed of the clergy as above, Hereford now proceeds to the profession of arms. For this discussion he finds no material at all in his original, and is under the necessity of drawing it from other sources, largely, perhaps, personal experience.[3] However, when he reaches the third estate, he returns again to his original for its discussion of the excesses of the working man's Sabbath. The labourer, Hereford declares, should not on that day devote himself to imbibing, but should :

take sum drinke on werk day, and not spende al on holy day ; ffor þis þing unables hom to serve God on holy day, and makes hom to feght as wode men, ȝe, more þen beestis done, ffor beestis kepen more mesure in etyng and drinkyng.[4]

A glance at the third italicized passage will, we think, reveal that Hereford has recast this passage to form the conclusion of his discussion of Gluttony.

A second opportunity for observing the Wyclifite commentator at work is provided by MS. Bibliothèque Ste Geneviève, Paris, 3390. Like Royal MS. XVII A 26, this is a collection of devotional tracts in English, written in the fifteenth century, but containing materials clearly extant in the fourteenth century. W. P. Cumming, the first to describe this manuscript,[5] declared that its interest lay " in the number of ' Wycliffite tracts ' in a non-Wycliffite form which it contains ".[6] Let us examine this statement.

[1] Arnold, iii. 157 (eight lines from top).

[2] Ibid. 130 ; see also Workman, ii. 8, n. 3.

[3] Jones considered that " the frequent references to knights and the nobility " pointed to " an author of high social standing, and, from what we can gather, Nicolas Hereford . . . was such a person " (*Anglia*, xxx. 267-8).

[4] Arnold, iii. 160 (twelve lines from top).

[5] W. P. Cumming, " A Middle English MS. in the Bibliothèque Ste Geneviève, Paris ", *PMLA*, xlii (1927), 862-4.

[6] Ibid. p. 864.

If the reader turns to fols. 30r-37r of MS. Bibl Ste Geneviève 3390, he encounters a short tractate on the three theological virtues. Cumming suggests this as the unaltered original of the Wyclifite " Faith, Hope, and Charity " printed by F. D. Matthew in his *English Works of Wyclif*.[1] At first glance a comparison of the two texts would seem to bear out Cumming's contention completely. To begin with, let us examine the discussion of Charity in fols. 34v-35r of the Bibl. Ste Geneviève manuscript :

þe þridde vertu of god is loue of charite / *and* it haþ two braunches / as loue of god *and* of man / *and* þe beste mene to kepe þis loue were a man to lere and loue to kepe two tables of godes hestes / for bi þis *and* ellus noȝt : kepit man hym in charite / and þis uertu cloþeþ man at domusday wiþ briȝt cloþes / and þis cloþ may neuere be lost in þis world ne in þe toþer / for no man may come to heuen : but ȝif he haue þis cloþing / ne no man may haue þis cloþing : but ȝif he come to heuene / and so men þat schul be dampned haue but feyned charite.

But lyue wel after godes lawe : *and* hope to have þis laste loue / for no man knoweþ ne schal trowe to haue hit : but god wille telle hym priueily.

The Wyclifite commentator follows exactly with only one slight variation (" bride-cloþis " for " briȝt cloþis "), but then adds :

and so freris, þat louen more her habite þat þei han ordeyned hem þan þe cloþe of charite þat god haþ schapen his sones, ben yuel disposid to haue þis cloþe of charite.[2]

To all appearances, one finds here the customary orthodox text plus Wyclifite addition. Nevertheless, despite the neat line it is here possible to draw between original and addition, it seems a little dangerous to suppose, as Cumming seems to, that because the addition is Wyclifite the original is orthodox.[3] One observes, for instance, that the Bibl. Ste Geneviève discussion of Charity, as reproduced above, has a quite distinct predestinarianism not very different from that of Wyclif himself.[4] To this necessary reservation, one must add

[1] EETS. OS. 74, 346-55. Matthew believed the tract to be an example of Wyclif's simple evangelical teaching (p. 346). Jones rejected it and attributed it without much confidence to Hereford (*Anglia*, xxx. 266-7). Workman classes it only as a work not by Wyclif (Workman, i. 330).

[2] Matthew, p. 352 (three lines from top).

[3] Cumming's analogy to the orthodox *Ten Commandments* would seen to make it clear that he regards the Bibl. Ste Geneviève *Faith, Hope, and Charity* as completely orthodox and the version published in Matthew as Wyclifite (*PMLA*, xlii. 863).

[4] Workman, ii. 9. Note in the Bibl. Ste Geneviève passage the presence of (1) unknowability of salvation, (2) man's duty to hope.

the presence in this same manuscript of a *Pater Noster* and *Apostles Creed*, both attributed by Arnold to Wyclif.[1] Of these, the first, the *Pater Noster*, is an ambiguous work which contains no clearly identifiable Wyclifite ideas, but, in numerous manuscripts, is found closely associated with Wyclifite tracts.[2] The *Apostles Creed*, however, has, in the form published by Arnold, two quite definite Wyclifite outbursts. The Bibliothèque Ste Geneviève manuscript possesses the first (fol. 24[r]):

oure bileue techeþ us: þat god ordeynede it al *and* bad þat men scholde kunne it *and* teche it to oþere and 3if prelates fayle in þis: cryst seyde þat stones scholde crye as secular lordes schulde in defaute of prelates lere and teche þe lawe of god in hor moder tunge.[3]

The second outburst is, however, lacking. As printed by Arnold, this reads:

And so, as sum men þynke, þese popys ne þese prelatys ar nat part of holy Chirche, but of synagoge; sethen þey mot leve aftyr Crist 3if þey schul be savyd. Þus techis oure beleve, howevyr Anticrist grucchis.[4]

If one should again be tempted to discover orthodox commentary altered by Wyclifite intruder, a brief consultation of the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS. at the point at which alteration commences[5] will tend to remove the temptation. No earthly man, says the commentator of the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS., is a part of the Church Triumphant:

but 3if he com to heuen bi his holi liuyng. *and* þus men lakkeþ kunnyng *and* knowyng: wheder þei ben partyes of holi chirche. for þei scholde not boste: of hi3enesse of hor prelacie.[6]

[1] Arnold, iii. 93; 114.

[2] See discussion below, p. 359.

[3] Arnold, iii. 114 (eight lines from beginning). Arnold's text reads "*and* secler lordys" rather than "*as* secular lordes".

[4] Arnold, iii. 116 (ten lines from bottom).

[5] The alteration actually begins with the interjected single sentence: "But þey mot leve aftyr Crist 3yf þey schul be savyd; ffor þus techis oure beleve, however Antecrist werke" (Arnold, iii. 116 [fourteen lines from bottom]). The two sentences which intervene between this single sentence and the attack on popes and prelates seem to be part of the base commentary, and are found both in the Arnold text and in the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS. (f. 26[v]). The three divisions of the Church here stated, although traditional, is also a Wyclifite idea (see Workman, ii. 8, n. 3).

[6] MS. Bibl. Ste Geneviève 3390, f. 26[v]. The passage quoted seems likewise to be part of the base commentary common to both the version printed by Arnold (see iii. 116, middle of page) and the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS.

Once again the sentiments here stated sound very much like applied Wyclifite predestinarianism in a characteristic form.[1] If one is correct in detecting in the supposed source an underlying Wyclifite tone, it seems likely that to the confusion arising from orthodox commentary altered by Wyclifite commentator, one must also add that of Wyclifite commentary altered by Wyclifite commentator.

The most dramatic and celebrated instance of Wyclifite adaptation is, of course, that of Archbishop Thoresby's *Ordinances*. As already noted, these were published in 1357 as a kind of reaffirmation, for the Province of York, of Pecham's *Ignorantia Sacerdotum*. At the same time, Archbishop Thoresby seems to have had the rather novel idea of giving his *Ordinances* greater circulation by accompanying them with an authorized English translation, said to be in alliterative unrhymed verse,[2] by one John de Gaytryge, or Gaysteke, or Caterige, or more probably Graystok,[3] a monk of St. Mary's, York. This *Catechism* was duly published, and after an uncertain interval there appeared a Wyclifite adaptation, promising, with a rare burst of humour, forty days of indulgence to all who learned it.[4] A comparison of the original *Catechism* and the adaptation reveals that the work in question was recast by much the same methods as those already observed. Ignoring the somewhat uncertain poetic medium of his original, the adapter inserted at appropriate

[1] Workman, ii. 9. See also *Lay Folks Catechism*, EETS. OS. 118. 18.

[2] See Brown and Robbins, *Index*, No. 406. The poetic nature of the translation seems, at times, open to question.

[3] "Graystok" would seem to be the most reasonable form yet suggested for the name of the Monk of York. We are indebted to Dr. J. S. Purvis, Director of the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York, for sending us this reading from the *Register* of Archbishop Thoresby.

[4] The Latin of Pecham and Thoresby, together with the authorized English translation and the Wyclifite revision, are all published together by T. F. Simmons and H. E. Nolloth under the title *The Lay Folks Catechism*, EETS. OS. 118. The edition of the Wyclifite adaptation is said to be edited from Lambeth MS. 408, with additions from York Minster XVI L 12. However, Miss Elizabeth Brunskill, Assistant Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, has been kind enough to send us an analysis of York XVI L 12, and this fails to show the presence of the Wyclifite adaptation.

points prose commentary of his own choice.[1] Thanks to the parallel columns in which the two versions are printed, the adapter's changes may be observed with welcome clarity. In the main, these changes constitute five insertions and one expansion. The insertions form a consecutive group (Pater Noster, Ave Maria, Creed, Five Bodily Wits, Five Ghostly Wits) and enter the text between Graystok's introduction and the exposition of his first topic, the Fourteen Articles of the Faith. On the other hand, the Ten Commandments of the Wyclifite revision are not an addition but an expansion, and are found in the same position as in Graystok's *Catechism*; i.e. as the second topic of exposition. The changes thus follow a recognizable pattern. The external appearance of the work is left intact, or, in this particular case, rendered more agreeable by a promise of indulgence, and the elements added give the revision the appearance of a standard popular manual. If, however, the general design of the revision is readily made out, the identity of the elements added remains puzzling. One would suppose that the additions made by a Wyclifite commentator would be works by Wyclif himself. Yet this appears only to a limited extent true. Of the works added, only one—the *Ave Maria*—can with any confidence be attributed to Wyclif himself.[2] Of the topics already present in Graystok (Ten Commandments, Seven Works of Mercy, etc.) only one is so materially altered as to become essentially a new tractate. This is, as indicated above, the Ten Commandments. Strangely enough, however, the alterations made in this topic are not made in terms of the tractate generally attributed to Wyclif himself, even though Wyclif's own *Ten Commandments*, like the *Ave Maria*, is considered an early work.[3] Even stranger, perhaps, is the fact that the Pater Noster added to this acidly Wyclifite *Catechism* is the same innocuous one contained in the Bibl. Ste Geneviève manuscript. The *Lay Folks Catechism*, perhaps the

[1] According to Brown and Robbins (*Index*, No. 406), the Wyclifite adaptation is also in unrhymed alliterative verse. When, however, one observes the presence of a whole prose tractate like the *Pater Noster* in an unaltered state, the principle upon which the poetry operates seems somewhat unclear.

[2] Jones, *Anglia*, xxx. 264; Winn, *Selections*, p. xxxvi; Workman, i. 331.

[3] Winn, p. xxxvi.

most celebrated of the Wyclifite revisions, remains certainly the most mysterious.

III. The *Pater Noster*

From the above discussion it will be apparent that clarity and simplicity are characteristics not to be looked for in the genealogy of the Wyclifite commentary. This principle may confidently be asserted with respect to the *Pater Noster*. Of this work we find three separate versions, all attributed to Wyclif himself. They are as follows :

Version I

Inc. " We schal beleue þat þis Pater Noster."

Des. " Delyvere us from yvel."

MSS. : (1) Bodl. 2643 (Bodley 789), fol. 97 (15th cent.) ; (2) Camb. Univ. Dd 1239, fol. 72^{v} (late 14th cent.) ; (3) Harley 2385, fol. 2 ; (4) Brit. Mus. Add. 17013 [*Book of the Vices and Virtues*], fol. 36^{r} (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph printed Arnold, iii. 96-7] ; (5) Lambeth 408 [*Lay Folks Catechism*], fol. 1^{v} (15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph] ; (6) Trinity Coll., Dublin C V 6, fol. 2^{r} (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph] ; (7) York Cathedral XVI L 12, fol. 32^{r} (2nd half 14th cent.) [lacks final paragraph] ; (8) Bibl. Ste Geneviève, Paris, 3390, fol. 27^{r} (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph].

Pub. : Arnold, iii. 93-7 ; EETS. OS. 217.336-9.[1]

Version II

Inc. " Sy*þ*þe þe Pater Noster is þe beste prayer þat is."

Des. " in joye wi*þ*oute eny ende ".

MSS. : (1) Bodl. 3054 [Bodley 938], fol. 24^{r} (first half 15th cent.) ; (2) Harley 2398, fol. 166^{v} (c. 1400-1410) ; (3) Rylands English 85, fol. 37^{r} (early 15th cent.) ; (4) Rylands English 90, [Corser], fol. 63^{r} (late 14th cent.) ; (5) Wrest park 32 (location unknown).

Pub. : Arnold, iii. 98-100.

Version III

Inc. " Oure fadir þat art in heuenes ".

Des. " tau3te þis schorte preiere ".

MS.: Corpus Christi Coll., Camb. 296, p. 172 (14th cent.).

Pub. : Matthew, pp. 198-202.

Version III may be disposed of briefly. It exists only in a single manuscript and is obviously related, as Matthew notes,[2] to Version II. However, the exact nature of the relationship is not

[1] The version published by W. N. Francis in EETS. OS. 217. 336-9 seems to be more typical in lacking the final paragraph than Bodley 789 in having it. Virtually all of the manuscripts here catalogued have been noted by Francis.

[2] Matthew, p. 197.

readily made out. Both Version III and Version II are based on a schematization of the Seven Petitions of the Pater Noster (discussed below). However, the verbal resemblances they have in common are slight, and the order of Version III varies materially from that of Version II.[1] It is therefore quite impossible that Version III should be a direct copy of Version II, or vice versa. Perhaps the most likely solution is that Version III borrowed his passage on the excellence of the Pater Noster from Version II,[2] but followed his own schematization of the Petitions.

Version I presents a fascinating puzzle. It was attributed to Wyclif by Dr. Shirley and after him by Thomas Arnold,[3] yet in reading it over one has a difficult time discovering a single expressly Wyclifite idea. This ambiguity is reflected by the manuscripts in which it occurs. It is found in strongly Wyclifite manuscripts like Lambeth 408, Trinity College, Dublin C V 6, and York Cathedral XVI L 12; in mixed manuscripts like Harley 2385, and in at least one entirely non-Wyclifite manuscript, Brit. Mus. Add. 17013 (*Book of Vices and Virtues*). On the basis of this evidence, one would hesitate to term it Wyclifite, much less attribute it to Wyclif himself. However, it must be remembered, that to be Wyclifite a work need not necessarily proclaim the hypocrisy of the friars or demand the reading of the whole Bible. The earlier Lollard position, shared by Wyclif,

[1] For the single notable verbal resemblance, compare " Certis þis pater noster passiþ alle oþere preieris in auctorite, in sotilte & profit " (Matthew, p. 201), with Arnold, iii. 99-100 (Version II) and with Arnold, iii. 93 (Version I). This latter passage is possibly the ultimate source of both. As regards order, Version II follows with one omission [Avarice] and one variation [reversal of Sloth and Avarice], the standard Gregorian listing of the sins. Hence in Version II the order is: Pride, Envy, Wrath, [Avarice], Sloth, Gluttony, Lechery. In Version III a captious hybrid order is followed: Pride, Envy, Avarice, Gluttony, Wrath, Temptation, Lechery. Perhaps the most convincing demonstration that Version III could not be a direct copy of Version II is that the Fourth Petition of Version II (Arnold, iii. 105-6) temporarily abandons the scheme and makes no mention whatsoever of either vice or virtue. Version III, however, does not at this point abandon its scheme, and discusses Gluttony and Prudence (Matthew, pp. 199-200).

[2] Matthew, p. 201; Arnold, iii. 99-100.

[3] See W. W. Shirley, *A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif* (Oxford, 1865), No. 11. 2: Arnold decided that 11. 1 and 11. 7 were not by Wyclif, but apparently considered 11. 2 to be genuine (Arnold, iii. vi, 93).

was much more moderate. An often cited passage from an early tract by Purvey reads :

> But if the ten commandments, the creed, pater noster and ave, that all Christian people ought to kunne, common things of holy writ, gospels and epistles read in church, be well translated and truly, sentence for sentence, with good declaration [i.e. exposition] whoso read it, he shall the better understand it, both in Latin and English.[1]

It seems quite possible that the *Pater Noster* we have been discussing may be an early work corresponding exactly to Purvey's definition—" well translated . . . with good declaration ". At least the Wyclifite compiler seems so to have understood it, for he constantly set it down side by side with expressly Wyclifite works. Thus it is quite true that this first and rather enigmatic version of the *Pater Noster* is found in all kinds of manuscripts, but in the great preponderance of them it is found associated with patently Wyclifite tracts.

The second version of the Pater Noster is entirely different from the first version in at least one important respect—not the slightest difficulty is encountered in classifying it as Wyclifite or non-Wyclifite. This second version contains diatribes against " symoniours, sillers of pardoun and indulgences " ; against religious who take upon themselves the " colour of perfeccioun " and imitate the Pharisees ; against those who hinder the preaching of the Word of God and " wolde þat þe gospel slepte ".[2] However, one mystery is simply exchanged for another. In reading it, one wonders why, despite its vigorous and spirited sallies, this second version of the Pater Noster remains so difficult a work to get through. The answer to this problem would seem to be that it follows a now quite unfamiliar scheme of petitions, vices, and virtues, and that it follows this scheme in a fashion not readily apprehended.

The unfamiliar scheme in question is the once exceedingly popular one of dividing the Pater Noster into seven petitions and then equating these seven petitions with further heptamerologies.[3]

[1] Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 272. Cited by Workman, ii. 156.

[2] Matthew, pp. 103, 109, 99.

[3] See the interesting article by Maurice Hussey, " The Petitions of the Pater Noster in Mediaeval English Literature ", *Medium Aevum*, xxvii (1958), 8-16.

For example, according to one very generally accepted arrangement, the Seven Petitions of the Pater Noster are answered by the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and these in turn confer the Seven Virtues Contrary to the Seven Deadly Sins, which, as their name rather distinctly implies, attack the Seven Vices. Thus, the First Petition " hallowed be Thy Name " is answered by the Gift of Dread (timor Dei), which confers Humility, which opposes Pride. This might be represented as :

Petition	*Gift*	*Virtue*	*Vice*
Hallowed be Thy Name	Fear	Humility	Pride

A variant of this scheme was made by Frère Lorens in his *Somme le Roi*, according to which the gift of God defeats the vice and plants a virtue in its place. As stated in terms of the First Petition : " ȝe ȝifte of drede . . . destroieþ þe rote of pride, and sett in his sted þe vertue of humblenesse." [1] This would appear as :

Petition	*Gift*	*Vice*	*Virtue*
Hallowed be Thy Name	Fear	Pride	Humility

Despite a certain strangeness, both of these schemes may be apprehended without great effort. The difficulty with the Wyclifite tract, however, is that the commentator, or the tractate he is following, attempts something rather original—he omits the Gifts of the Holy Ghost and doubles the virtues ; that is, the Petition is answered, not by a gift of the Holy Ghost, but directly by a virtue, which opposes the sin, which leaves—although this is never clearly stated—a second virtue. Thus two sets of virtues are in use : a relatively flexible list of Virtues Opposed to the Seven Deadly Sins (" Mekenesse, Pacience, Charite, Besinesse, Mesure, Chastite, Largesse "),[2] and a relatively fixed list of Principal Virtues (Three Theological, Four Cardinal). The operation of this new schematization may be observed in the first two petitions of the Wyclifite *Pater Noster.*

As to the firste, we schulle ywyte þat Crist, whanne he tauȝte ous to seye oure Fader, he betoke ous *mekenesse*, and bad ous fle *pryde*. . . .

And ryȝt as we beþ tauȝt in þe first axynge, to destroye *pryde* by verraye *mekenesse*, whanne we seyeþ, Fader oure þat art in hevenys, halewede be þy name,

[1] *Book of the Vices and Virtues*, EETS. OS. 217. 126.

[2] C. Horstman, *Yorkshire Writers* (London, 1895-6), i. 111.

ryȝt so we beth ytauȝt in þys secunde axynge to destroye *envye* aȝens oure evene Cristen with parfite *charite*, whanne we seyeþ, Come to þe þy kyngdom. And as it is nedeful in þe firste axynge specialyche to have parfyt *feyþ*, þat God oure Fader is in hevenys, so it nedeþ specialyche in þis secunde axynge þat we have *hope*, þat alle þylke þat we supposeþ be his kyngdom schulde regne wiþ him in blysse of Hevene.[1]

If taken together, these two passages come out somewhat as follows :

Petition	*Virtue Opposed*	*Vice*	*Principal Virtue*
Hallowed be Thy Name	Humility	Pride	Faith
Thy Kingdom come	Charity	Envy	Hope

It will be apparent from the above that the Petitions when completed are to be matched by the full list of the Virtues opposed, the Seven Deadly Sins, and the Three Theological and Four Cardinal Virtues.[2] It is, however, characteristic of the Wyclifite commentator that the theological scheme should, at points, be forced to yield ignominiously to declamation on favourite topics. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the Fourth Petition : " oure echeday bred ȝef ous to day ", when interpreted on the spiritual level as the " lore of Godes worde ", should lead to a spirited attack on the failure of the Church to carry out its duty of preaching, and with it a defence of the Wyclifite remedy :

And þus yf, þurghe necligence of oure byschopes and prelatȝ, and oþer false techers þat be in holy Churche, þe truþe of Godes word be nouȝt ysowe in þe peple, praye we Jesus Crist byschepe of oure soule, þat he ordeyne prechours in þe peple to warne hem of synne, and telle hem þe truþe of God.[3]

It is even less surprising to find that under the stress of powerful emotions the commentator has, in the Fourth Petition, completely forgotten his schematized vices and virtues.

The second version of the *Pater Noster* is a richly rewarding work for any study of the history of the Lollard movement, and unquestionably deserves thorough investigation. When such investigation is made, the holdings of the John Rylands Library will

[1] Arnold, iii. 101, 104.

[2] The scheme is actually carried through with some completeness. One finds towards the end treatments of Business vs. Sloth, of Abstinence vs. Gluttony, and of Chastity vs. Lechery (Arnold, iii. 107-8). The scheme of the Principal Virtues seems, however, to have dropped after Faith, Hope, and Charity. It is nevertheless continued throughout in Version III.

[3] Arnold, iii. 106.

be found to be of great value, for the Rylands Library now possesses exactly half of the manuscripts of this rare work presently available for consultation.[1]

IV. The *Ten Commandments*

The preceding discussion has from time to time pointed out the confusion introduced by the Wyclifite practice of rewriting existing commentary. In the *Ten Commandments* the problems attendant upon this practice are brought to their fullest development. The reason for the unhappy eminence attained by the *Ten Commandments* in this respect is the existence of at least three separate versions of this work, all possessing a virtually identical incipit: "Alle maner of men schulden holde Godes biddynges"; "Alle manere of men schulde holde þe comaundementis of God"; "Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis", etc. The first and most eminent victim of reliance upon this treacherous incipit was Dr. W. W. Shirley who, in his *Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif* (1865),[2] listed works in five manuscripts, all possessing this incipit, as genuine Wyclif. By 1871, Thomas Arnold had, in his *Select English Works*, distinguished between Wyclif's own version and a "pre-existing commentary" which he took to be its source. Arnold's conclusions have met general acceptance, and from the time of his edition various scholars, notably W. P. Cumming and W. Nelson Francis, have continued Arnold's original effort to separate the manuscripts of the orthodox commentary from the version taken to be Wyclif's own.[3] Within recent years, however, the validity of Arnold's conclusions has been questioned. In 1942, Mr. Samuel Ives described a manuscript, then in the possession of

[1] The Wrest Park manuscripts were sold at Sotheby's on 19-21 June 1922. Wrest Park 32 was contained in lot 641. At this date no list of purchasers is available. The manuscript appears at the present time to be in private hands. Rylands English 85 and 90 therefore constitute half of the manuscripts of this work available to scholars. For information relative to Wrest Park 32, we are indebted to Dr. R. W. Hunt, Keeper of Western Manuscripts, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and to Professor S. Harrison Thomson, the University of Colorado.

[2] Bodl. 789, Laud Misc. 524, Trinity Coll., Dublin, C.V. 6, Royal XVII A 26, Univ. Coll., Oxford, 97. See *Catalogue*, No. 40.

[3] Arnold, iii. 82; *PMLA*, xlii. 862; EETS. OS. 217. 317.

H. P. Kraus, which he declared to be the true and unpublished version of Wyclif's *Ten Commandments*, and the source of the text accepted by Arnold.[1] In 1954, Dr. Curt F. Bühler published a manuscript now in the Morgan Library (Morgan 861) which he said "may possibly be the 'pre-existing commentary' which Arnold believed Wyclif may have used".[2] To these recently noticed manuscripts, it is now possible to add a new and highly important one. This is John Rylands English MS. 85,[3] which on fols. 2v-9r contains an unpublished version of the *Ten Commandments*, clearly related both to the generally accepted Wyclif version and to Morgan 861.

In view of the very considerable conflict of opinion concerning the relationship of the manuscripts of the *Ten Commandments*, it would seem useful to state the underlying problems and to attempt a solution. A procedure leading to this end might involve (*a*) a view of the manuscripts as a whole, (*b*) a study of the available evidence to determine which, if any, version was written by Wyclif, and what relationship the various manuscript groups have to this version. As a first step, a catalogue of the manuscripts is offered

[1] Samuel A. Ives, "The Genuine and Unpublished Version of Wyclif's Treatise on the Ten Commandments", *Rare Books*, iii (New York: H. P. Kraus, 1942), 3-9.

[2] Curt F. Bühler, "The Middle English Texts of Morgan MS. 861", *PMLA*, lxix (1954), 686-91.

[3] Rylands English MS. 85 is described by Moses Tyson in his "Hand-List of English Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library", BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, xiii (1929), 168. A somewhat more detailed analysis of the manuscript follows. Topics discussed in the present paper are italicized. The editors are indebted to Professor S. Harrison Thomson for bringing this extremely interesting manuscript to their attention.

2r Prologue and Alphabet
2r Pater Noster
2r Ave Maria
2r Creed
2v *Ten Commandments*
9r Seven Deadly Sins
13r Five Bodily Wits
13v Five Ghostly Wits
13v Seven Virtues
15r Seven Works Bodily Mercy
15v Seven Works Ghostly Mercy
16r Seven Gifts of Holy Ghost
18v Seven Sacraments
19r Prologue on Order of Topics
19v Twelve Lettings of Prayer
24v Prologue on Belief
25v Diverse Degrees of Love
37r *Pater Noster*
54v Mirrour of Sinners
64r Charter of Heaven
72v Three Arrows

herewith. Some of these are well known, others are here catalogued for the first time.

I. *Orthodox or "Pre-Existing" Commentary*

Inc. "Alle maner of men schuld holde goddys biddyngs".

Des. "too þat blisse god vs bryng".

MSS. (1) Bodl. 1049 (Laud Misc. 524), fol. 10r (15th cent.); (2) Univ. Coll. Oxford, 97, p. 169 (15th cent.); (3) Emmanuel Coll., Camb. 246, fol. 59r (late 14th cent.); (4) B.M. Harley 218, fol. 159; (5) B.M. Harley 2346, fol. 34 (mid 15th cent.); (6) Royal XVII A 26, fol. 4r (mid 15th cent.); (7) B.M. Add. 22283 [*Book of Vices and Virtues*], fol. 92r (late 14th cent.) (8) Westminster School 3, fol. 73 (c. 1420); (9) Bibl. Ste Geneviève, Paris, 3390 (early 15th cent.), fol. 1r; (10) Garrett [Princeton Univ. Deposit 1459], fol. 1 (c. 1400); (11) Huntington HM 744, fol. 13v (15th cent.).[1]

Pub.: EETS. OS. 217.317 (ed. W. N. Francis).

II. *Wyclifite Commentary*

A. *Version Attributed to Wyclif*

Inc. "Alle manere of men schulde holde þe comaundementis of God".

Des. "þou herdist not þe word of þi Lord God".

MS. Bodl. 2643 (Bodley 789), fol. 108 (first half 15th cent.).

Pub.: Arnold, iii. 82-92.

B. *Expanded Versions*

Inc. "Alle maner of men shulden holde Goddis biddyngis".

Des. "out of boundes of helle" (Harley): "þe blisse of heuene" (Trin. Coll.); unknown (York).

MSS. (1) Harley 2398, fol. 73 (c. 1400-1410); (2) Trinity Coll., Dublin C V 6, fol. 9r (early 15th cent.); (3) York Minster XVI L 12, fol. 1 (second half 14th cent.).[2]

C. *Compressed Versions*

(1) Rylands English 85, fol. 2v (early 15th cent.).

Inc. "Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis".

Des. "alle oþer þat ony man doiþ".

[1] Of the manuscripts here catalogued, only four have previously been noticed in this connection. Laud and University Coll. are pointed out by Arnold (iii. 82), and B.M. Add. 22283 by Francis (EETS. OS. 217. 317), and Bibl. Ste Geneviève by Cumming (*PMLA*, xlii. 862). Royal XVII A 26 (see above, p. 351, n. 2) and Huntington HM 744 (see De Ricci, *Census*) have been classified as Wyclifite. They both contain, however, the standard text of Laud and of the published B.M. Add. 22283. Huntington has the unusual incipit: "Alle cristene men."

[2] The classification of York Minster XVI L 12 and Harley 2398 was made on the basis of extracts rather than a view of the entire manuscript. Acknowledgement for assistance is made to Miss Elizabeth Brunskill, Assistant Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York, and to Dr. Dorothy M. Broome.

(2) Lambeth 408 [*Lay Folks Catechism*], fol. 6^{v} (15th cent.).
Inc. " Thys ys þe fyrste of godys comaundementys ".
Des. " of suche wrongful coveytynge ".
Pub.: EETS. OS. 118. 33 (ed. Simmons and Nolloth).

(3) Morgan 861, fol. 1^{r} (mid 15th cent.).
Inc. " Here begynneth the ten commaundementis of God ".
Des. " þou schalt not coueite it wrongfully ".
Pub.: *PMLA*, lxix (1954), 686-92 (ed. C. F. Bühler).

(4) Plimpton Addenda 3 [Columbia Univ. Library], fol. 241^{v} (*c.* 1400).
Inc. " I am þi lord God þat ledde þee ".
Des. " on suche wrongful coueytinge ".

(5) Bodl. 21820 (Douce 246), fol. 101^{v} (15th cent.).
Inc. " This is þe first maundement ".
Des. " þis lawe sufficeþ to þe ".[1]

It will be observed that the manuscripts fall into various groups, some of them considerably less homogeneous than others. Generally speaking, the manuscripts of orthodox commentary or, to use Arnold's term, " pre-existing commentary " are demonstrably all closely related and offer a quite consistent text. The Wyclifite commentaries, on the other hand, seem to follow the pattern discussed above—source plus extemporization. This is, of course, less true of the compressed versions—where for instance Rylands 85 and Morgan 861 are consistently parallel in text—but for the longer versions like Trinity College, Dublin C V 6 the garrulous tone is evident.

With the various versions of the *Ten Commandments* roughly sorted out, one is faced with the problem of determining their relationship. This problem is by no means a simple one, because Wyclif abstained entirely from mentioning his English works, and the only evidence available is internal evidence. In

[1] Douce 246 is catalogued at the end of this group because the basis for its inclusion is questionable. It does not translate the Commandments accurately, as do the other members of this group, but tends to paraphrase. Furthermore, it lacks the characteristic language of the Eighth Commandment: " Liers, glosers, and false questmongers ", which all four other manuscripts possess. However, its organization is very similar to the others, and its tone is, at points, rather Wyclifite. As for instance, at fol. 102^{v}: " the þrid maundement of þis table is broken on many maners. And specially by þes men þat letten godes wif to love god as sche schuld and þis avoutrie is þe moste. The fourþe maundement is broken by many 3iftes þat men usen and generally whan men takyn goddes goodes þat al men schuld have and 3et serven not treuly to god ne to his cherche." The whole small treatise sounds very much like a watered-down version of the others.

dealing with the Wyclifite commentary, the investigator, therefore, lacks any real assurance as to what, if any, works Wyclif himself wrote. The *Ten Commandments*, however, in the version printed by Arnold from Bodley 789, possesses the rare distinction of being one of the few works accepted as genuine Wyclif. In addition to Arnold, numerous scholars—Jones, Winn, and Workman—have stated its authenticity.[1] Only Ives has disputed the attribution, but the passages he adduces as evidence are all to be found, for instance, in Trinity College, Dublin C V 6, and it is to be doubted that anyone reading the version of the Ten Commandments contained therein could believe it to be Wyclif.[2]

If the Bodley *Ten Commandments* may with some assurance be regarded as a genuine work of Wyclif's, it is perhaps here that one may best begin to examine the relationships of the various manuscript groups. Was, for instance, Arnold right in believing the Bodley *Ten Commandments* to be derived from the orthodox or " pre-existing " commentary ? A comparison of the Prologue and first three Commandments in Brit. Mus. Add. 22283 (Orthodox) [3] and Bodley 789 (Wyclif) is revealing.

Brit. Mus. Add. 22283 (O)	Bodley 789 (W)
Prologue	
Alle maner of men. schulden holde Godes biddynges. For wᵗouten holdynge of hem. mai no mon beo saued. And so þe gospel telleþ. hou on askede of Crist : what he schulde do. forto come to heuene. And crist bad him. if he wolde entre into blisse : þᵗ he schulde kepe þe Comaundemens of God . . . (EETS 217.317)	Alle manere of men schulde holde þe comaundementis of God, for wiþouten holdynge of hem may no man be savyd. And so þe gospel telliþ how oon askide Crist what he schulde do for to come to hevene. And Crist seide, ȝif þou wolt come to blisse, kep myn comaundementis (III, 82).

[1] Jones, *Anglia*, xxx. 264 ; Winn, *Select English Writings*, p. xxxvi ; Workman, ii. 160.

[2] Ives points out three passages in the Kraus manuscript which parallel passages in the Fifth, Seventh, and Tenth Commandments of Wyclif. These three passages are reproduced in *Rare Books*, iii. 7 and are matched respectively in Trinity College Dublin C V 6 by passages on fol. 19ʳ, fol. 21ʳ, and fol. 25ᵛ. Something of the tone of the Trinity College manuscript may be gathered from part of the discussion on the First Commandment. Gluttons, says the commentator, make their bellies their god, " for loue þat þei louen it. And bi þe same skile þes foule lecchours maken her god þe taile eende of an hoore " (fol. 10ᵛ).

[3] Published as an appendix to *Book of the Vices and Virtues*, ed. W. N. Francis, EETS. OS. 217.317.

First Commandment

And so what þing enimon loueþ most : þ^t þing he makeþ his god. in as muche as in him is. beo hit wyf. or child. gold. or seluer. or eny catel . . . Of þis foleweþ. þ^t þre manere of folk suwen þe sturynge of oure þreo enemys : whuche ben þe flesch. þe world. and þe feond. . . . As for þe furste. Lecherous. and gloterous men þei loue more heore wombes þen god. and so heore wombes þei maken heore god. Of hem speke þ seint poul *Ad philipenses. iiij ;* and seiþ þus. *Multi ambulant* . . . þat is. Monye gon. of þe w3uche. ofte I. haue seid to 3ou : and nou I seye wepynge . . . of whom heore wombe is heore god . . . So þise men þt louen heore flesch. and Lecherie. or gloterie. þei maken heore wombe heore god . . . þe secounde maner of men. þ^t breken þis comaundement. and also maken hem false goddes : beon Couetouse men . . : and þei maken such worldly goodes. synfully heore false goddes for as seint poul seiþ. *Ad ephesios v. Avarus quod est ydolorum seruitus.* þ^t is. An auerous mon. or a couetous : is þraldom of maumetes. For such a couetous mon . . . doþ maumetrie . . . þe þridde maner of men. þ^t breken þis comaundement. þat folowen þe fend : beon þo þat setten heore hertes most on worldly worschipes. and veyn glorie. and hei3nesse of hemself. (318-19)

what maner þing þat a man loveþ moost, he makiþ his god ; and so, syþþe al synne stondiþ in love, everi heed synne is brekynge of þis heeste . . . And siþen þei ben þre synnes, as Seynt Joon seiþ, þat enwrappeþ alle oþere, in þre maneris may a man breke þis maundement,—in þes þre, love of fleische, and love of ei3e, and pride of liif. And so glotouns and lecchouris breken þis heeste ; as Poul seiþ, þat þes glotouns makyn hire beli hire god . . . And on þe same wise þe coveytous man makiþ his mawmet þe temporal goodis, as Poul seiþ þat averyce is service of mawmetis. And so þe proude man makiþ þe feend his god. (83)

Second Commandment

And þerfore crist him self in þe. gospel of Seint matheu *capitulo* v : biddeþ þus. *Nolite iurare omnino* . . . þat is. swere 3e not on alle manere . . . But 3oure word beo. 3e 3e. nay. nay. And þ^t. þat is more ouur þis : hit is of euel. Thise ben cristes wordes in the gospel . . . And 3if 3e schullen swere : rule 3ow aftur þe lawe of god. in 3or swerynge. For god him self techeþ þe. þ^t when þu swerest : þu schalt kepe þreo condicouns. *Iurabis* inquid *in ueritate. in iudicio.* & *Iusticia. Ieremye iiij capitulo.* þat is. þou schalt swere in treuþe. In dom. and in rihtwysnesse. (320)

Crist techiþ in þe gospel to have oure wordis þus, 3he, 3he, and nai, nay, wiþouten ony ooþ . . . For God techiþ bi Jeremie þe prophete, wiþ þre condiciouns it is leefful to swere. First þat þei be war þat þei swere treuþe, and þat þe cause of hire oþ be to schewe ri3t, and siþen, þat in jugement be it need to swere ; and ellis schulde alle men kepe hem from oþis. (84)

Third Commandment

þu schalt þenken hou god made þe world of nouȝt on a sunday. And hou he sette wit. and wisdam on a sunday in to eorþe. And þt he a ros fro deþ to lyf. on a sunday. And þt schulde fere ȝou alle : and perse ȝor hertes. And vppon a sunday as clerkes seyn : schal beo domes day. (322)

For upon þe Sunday God made þe worlde, and on þe Sunday God roos fro deeþ to lyve, and on þe Sunday he sente þe holi Goost, and, as clerkis seyn, upon þe Sundai schal be þe laste jugement þat ever man schal have. (85)

The clear parallels to be noted here would seem strongly to support Arnold's belief in Wyclif's indebtedness to the orthodox commentary. However, since it has recently been suggested that the commentary on which Wyclif drew may in fact be Morgan 861,[1] it is worth while to compare the Wyclif *Ten Commandments* with those of Morgan 861 and its related text, Rylands English 85.

Bodley 789 (W)	Rylands English 85	Morgan 861
Prologue		
Alle manere of men schulde holde þe comaundementis of God, for wiþouten holdynge of hem may no man be savyd. And so þe gospel telliþ how oon askide Crist what he schulde do for to come to hevene. And Crist seide, ȝif þou wolt come to blisse. kep myn comaundementis. (Arnold, iii. 82)	Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis. for wiþoute keping *and* rulyng bi hem : mai no man be saued / and so þe gospel telliþ. hou oon askite Crist what he shulde do : forto come to heuene / and Crist bade him if he wolde entre in to blis : þat he shulde kepe þe comaundementis of God. (p. 371)	
First Commandment		
as Poul seip þat averyce is service of mawmetis. (83)	as Poul seiþ / an avarous man is a seruaunt of mawmetis. (p. 372)	as Poul seiþ . . . an auerouse man is a seruant of mawmentis. (PMLA, lxix. 689)

[1] Bühler, *PMLA*, lxix. 688, n. 6.

Second Commandment

A man much sweringe schal be fulfilled with wickidnesse, and veniaunce schal not go awey fro his hous. For soþe wiþ werst ȝeldinge schal be fulfillid þe hous of hiin. (84)	a man moche sweringe : shal be fulfild wiþ wickidnesse / and veniaunce *with* worst ȝilding : shal not go fro his hous (p. 372)	a man myche swerynge schal be fulfilled wiþ wickydnes. and veniaunce schal not go fro his hous (689).

Third Commandment

þou schalt do no servile werk. (85)	þou shalt not do ony seruyle werk. (p. 373)	þou schalt do no seruyse werke. (690)

The results of these two comparisons are informative. First, it is apparent that the Wyclif commentary could well have been derived from the orthodox commentary, and the shorter commentaries in turn from the Wyclif work. This would seem a normal kind of development in terms of the popular " schort wordes " approach. The reverse process would obviously pose great difficulties. For instance, in the First Commandment indebtedness to the short tractates would involve Wyclif's creating the whole 1 *John* ii. 16 passage : " love of fleisch, and love of eiȝe, and pride of liif " from a single reference to " maumetis ", whereas the world, the flesh, and the devil, found in the orthodox commentary, are usual equivalents for the three sins of 1 *John* ii. 16.

A second result which follows from the above comparisons is the importance of Rylands English MS. 85. It is apparent that the Rylands manuscript is closer at virtually every point to the Wyclif original than Morgan 861, or indeed any of the group of manuscripts of which it is a part. Manuscripts of this group like Plimpton Addenda 3 have become so simplified as to become little more than lists. Were it not for the characteristically Wyclifite tone of the breakers of the Eighth Commandment, " liers, glosers, and false questmongers ", common to Rylands, Morgan, Plimpton, and the Wyclifite *Lay Folks Catechism* (Lambeth 408), one might be unaware of their Wyclifite origins. Fortunately, the Rylands manuscript, particularly by reason of its prologue, preserves this link in a distinct and recognizable form, and this same relationship is rendered more distinct

by the verbatim correspondences between the *Exodus* translations of the Late Version of the Wyclifite *Bible* (c. 1388-1400) and those of the Rylands manuscript. Since the *Ten Commandments* of Rylands English MS. 85 have not previously been published, an edition of them is here presented. The relationship of the text to the Wyclifite *Bible*, the *Lay Folks Catechism*, and the Morgan tract is recorded in the footnotes.

V. The *Ten Commandments* from Rylands English MS. 85

A Short Prolog on þe Heestis / [1]

Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis. for wiþoute keping *and* rulyng bi hem : mai no man be saued / and so þe gospel telliþ. hou oon as [fol. 3r] kite Crist what he shulde do : forto come to heuene / and Crist bade him if he wolde entre in to blis : þat he shulde kepe þe comaundementis of God.[2]

Almyȝti God seiþ in his lawe on þis wise. who so seiþ þat he loueþ me *and* kepiþ not myn heestis : he is a lier. *and* truþe is not in hym [3] / and as God seiþ þe feend is fadir of alle lesyngis [4] / þerfore lest we bicomen þe feendis children þoruȝ lesyngis : knowe we [5] sadli Goddis ten heestis. *and* kepe we hem bisili at al oure myȝt. as trewe men to Ihesus Crist / and wite þou wel þat oure Lord Ihesus Crist haþ not bodun us do : but þat we mai wel kepe wiþ þe help of Goddis grace : if we doen oure bisynesse þerto. for ellis it hadde be aȝens resoun to haue boundun men vp peyne of her dampnacioun to haue kept hise heestis / *and* in oure God mai noon vnresoun be bi ony maner way [fol. 3v] and so God seiþ in his gospel to alle manere men. my charge is liȝt. *and* my ȝok is swete [6] / and Seynt Iohn þe euangelist seiþ þe charge of God is to kepe hise heestis / *and* þei ben not greuous [7] neþer heuy.[8]

[1] Capitals are supplied for proper nouns and for names of the Deity, but since the punctuation of the scribe is understandable, it has been reproduced with only the slightest of changes. All paragraphs except the second are either preceded by a paragraph sign in the manuscript or follow rubrics. Rubrics are capitalized as headings.

[2] Matthew xix. 16-17 ; Luke x. 25.

[3] I John ii. 4, changed to direct discourse.

[4] John viii. 44.

[5] Marginal insertion of " we ".

[6] Matthew xi. 30, before which the first words of the incipit are here repeated. See " my ȝoc is swete . . . / and my charge liȝt ", EV, as well as " . . . charge is liȝt ", LV, MSS. EIKR. *The Holy Bible . . . in the Earliest English Versions made . . . by John Wycliffe and his followers*, ed. Josiah Forshall and Frederick Madden (Oxford, 1850), iv. 28.

[7] The repetition of this word is deleted..

[8] I John v. 3. The rendering does not agree with either of the Bible translations, in which, however, one finds " greuous " (EV) and " heuy " (LV). Forshall and Madden, iv. 628. Nothing in the Morgan tract corresponds to this second paragraph.

Þe Ffirst Comaundement of God is Þis /

The Lord spak alle Þese wordis / I am Þi Lord God Þat ledde Þee out of Þe loud of Egipt : fro Þe hous of seruage . Þou shalt not haue alien goddis bifore me / Þou shalt not make to Þee a grauun ymage. neÞer ony licnesse Þat is in heuene aboue. *and* which is in erÞe byneÞe : neÞer of Þo Þingis Þat ben in watris vndir erÞe : Þou shalt not herie Þo : neÞer Þou shalt worshipe / for I am Þi Lord God : a strong gelous louer / and I visite Þe wickidnesse of fadris *in* sones : *in* to Þe Þridde *and* Þe ferÞe generacioun [fol. 4r] of hem Þat haten me / and I do merci in to a Þousynd : to hem Þat louen me *and* kepen myn heestis.[1]

In Þis ffirst heeste it is tauȝt Þat Þou shalt haue noon oÞir God : but Þe Lord God of Heuene / *and* him Þou shalt loue of al Þin herte : of al Þi soule *and* of al Þi mynde.[2]

Who brekiÞ Þe first comaundement / proude men. worldli men. *and* fleshli men // Whi proude men : for thei maken Þe deuel her god. as Iob seiÞ / Þe deuel is king vpon alle Þe sones of pride // Whi worldli men : for Þei maken worldli goodis her god. as Poul seiÞ / an auarous man is a seruaunt of mawmetis : *and* shal not enherite Þe kyngdom of heuene ¶ Whi fleshli men : for Þei maken her wombe her god. as Poul seiÞ / Be ȝe my folowers. *and* a waite ȝe hem Þat walken so : for many walken Þat ben enemyes to Cristis Cros / [fol. 4v] whos eend is deeÞ *and* her wombe is Þer god.[3]

Iob. xlj.° [25]

Ephe. v.° [5]

Phip. iij.° [17-19]

Þe Secunde Comaundement of God is Þis /

Thou shalt not take in vayn : Þe name of Þi Lord God / for Þe Lord shal not haue him giltles : Þat takiÞ in veyn Þe name of his Lord God /[4]

And Crist seiÞ Þat is truÞe / Þou shalt not swere bi heuene : Þat is bi no Þing Þat is in heuene / neÞer bi erÞe : Þat is bi noon erÞeli Þing / neÞer bi Ierusalem : for it is Þe grete citee of Þe Lord. which is mannes soule / neÞer bi Þin heed : Þat is to seie. bi noon of Þi membris eÞer heer.[5]

Who breken Þis comaundement / veyn spekers. Grete swerers. *and* wickid worchers. ¶ Whi veyn spekers : for her wordis ben not needful / Off which Crist seiÞ / Off euery idil word Þat men speken : Þei shulen ȝilde rikenyng at Þe dai of doom ¶ Whi grete swerers : [fol. 5r] ffor her ooÞis ben not needful. as seiÞ Þe Wise Man / a man moche sweringe : shal be fulfild wiÞ wickidnesse / *and* veniaunce

Mt. xij.° [36]

Ecc.ci xxiij.° [12]

[1] Exod. xx. 1-6. It agrees with LV except for "ony licnesse Þat", which agrees with EV. For the Rylands reading "Fadris *in* sones", see LV, MSS. A *sec. m.* CDGKMNOQRTWX *sec. m.*, as well as EV. Forshall and Madden, i. 238.

[2] Luke x. 27.

[3] In the list of "breakers" and in the triple explanations, the Morgan text has at first "feend" for "deuel" and, with *Lay Folks Catechism* (1), "bellyes" for "wombe", a reading which Morgan repeats in the confirmatory quotation. The Rylands use of "wombe" in both instances accords with EV and LV (Forshall and Madden, iv. 426).

[4] Exod. xx. 7 agrees with LV.

[5] Matt. v. 34-6, a paraphrase of the Biblical words.

with worst ȝilding: shal not go fro his hous / ¶ Whi wickid worchers: for her werkis ben vnleeful /. of whiche Poul seiþ / awaite ȝe hem þat letten þe lawe of God: *and* dele ȝe not *with* hem / for bi softe speche. þei disseiuen þe hertis of *innocent* men // [1] *Ro. xvj.°* [18]

Þe Þridde Comaundment of God is Þis /

Haue þou mynde. þat þou halowe þe dai of þe Saboth / In sixe daies þou shalt worche: *and* do alle þi werkis / forsoþe in þe seuenþe dai of þe Saboth of þi Lord God: þou shalt not do ony seruyle werk / þou *and* þi sone *and* þi douȝtir. *and* þi seruaunt *and* þin handmaide / þi werkbeest: *and* þe comelyng. which is wiþinne þi ȝatis / for in sixe daies God made heuene *and* erþe. [fol. 5ᵛ] þe see *and* alle þingis þat ben in þo: *and* restide *in* þe seuenþe dai [2] and herfore þe Lord blesside þe dai of þe Saboth: *and* halowide it / [3]

Who breken þis þridde comaundement / þo men þat þenken not on God herteli. *and* þei þat preien Him not deuoutli, and þei þat doen not þe dedis of merci wysli ¶ Whi þo men þat þenken not on God herteli: for þei ocupien her þouȝtis *with* vanytees / to whiche God seiþ bi his prophete Michee / Wo to ȝou þat þenken vnprofitable þouȝtis: worchinge yuel in ȝoure couchis in þe morwe liȝt ¶ Whi þo þat preien Him not deuoutli: For þei worshipen Him wiþ her lippis *and* not wiþ her hertis. as Crist seiþ bi Matheu / þis peple *with* lippis worshipen me: but forsoþe her hertis ben fer fro me ¶ Whi þo men þat doen not wiseli þe werkis of mercy: for þei leuen vertues *and* ȝy[fol. 6ʳ] uen hem to vicis as Iohn seiþ / liȝt cam in to þe world. *and* men loueden more derknessis þan liȝt: for her werkis weren yuele.[4]

ij. c.° [1]

xv.[°] [8]

iij.° c.° [19]

Þe Fferþe Comaundement of God is Þis /

Honoure þi fadir *and* þi modir: þat þou be long lyuynge on þe lond which þi Lord God shal ȝyue to þee.[5]

[1] *Matthew xii. 36:* "euery idil", agrees with Ev—"eny idil", M; "rikenynge"—"resoun þerof" EV, LV, M. *Eccl. xxiii. 12:* "*with* . . . ȝilding"—omitted in M. *Ro. xvi. 18:* "softe speche"—"her soft speche", M; "innocent men"—"innocent men and wymmen", M.

[2] Written "daie", but corrected.

[3] Exod. xx. 11 agrees with LV. For "and do all", see LV, MSS. DKOS; for "seuen þe dai of þe Saboth", see LV, MSS. BCDEKLMNOQRSTX; for "ony seruyle werk", see LV, MS. I (note also MS. S; Wyclyfite tract, p. 85; "seruyse werke" M).

[4] *Micah ii. 1:* given incorrectly in M as "miache [?] . . . *iij. c*". *Mt. xv:* "*with* lippis worshipen me"—"worschipiþ me wiþ lippes", M; "but forsoþe her"—"but her", M. *John iii. 19:* "derknessis"—"derkenesse", M ("derknessis", EV, LV).

[5] Exod. xx. 12-13 agrees with LV.

Who breken þis ferþe comaundement ¶ vnkynde men. froward men : *and* rebel men ¶ Whi vnkynde men : [1] ffor þei helpen not her eldris as þei shulden. of whiche þe wise Man seiþ / He þat worshipiþ fadir *and* modir : shal be maad myri in sones / *and* he is cursid of God : þat teriþ hem to wraþ ¶ Whi ffroward men : for þei wolen take no goostli teching. as Isaie seiþ / Sones of frowardnesse not willynge to heere þe lawe of God : þat seien speke to us plesaunt þingis. þouȝ it be errours ¶ Whi rebel men : for þei ben [fol. 6^{v}] vnbuxum to Crist *and* to his churche. as weren Dathan *and* Abiron / þat for vnbuxumnesse to Moyses *and* Aaron : sanken doun to helle alquyk. wyf. *and* child. wiþ al þat longide to hem.[2]

[*Ecc. iii. 6, 18*]

xxx.° [9-10]

Numerj. xvi.° [27-33]

Þe Ffifþe Comaundement of God is þis /

Thou shalt not slee.[3]

Who breken þis ffifþe comaundement, enuyouse men. wraþful men. *and* auarouse men ¶Whi enuyouse men : for þei haten or bacbiten her briþeren / of whiche spekiþ Iohn in his pistle / ech man þat hatiþ his broþer : is a mansleer / and he þat seiþ he loueþ God. *and* hatiþ his broþir : he is a lier ¶ Whi wraþful men : for þei smyten or dispisen her briþeren. as Seint Austyn seiþ / [4] a wraþful man is hateful to God : *and* he is felowe to feendis ¶ Whi auarouse men : for þei releeuen not in nede þer euencristen. to whiche wiþ þe [fol. 7^{r}] Wise Man / Haue mynde of pouert *in* tyme of plente. *and* þe nede of pouert [5] *in* þe dai of richesse / fro erli vnto euen þe tyme shal chaunge.[6]

[*1 Jn. iii. 15, iv. 20*]

Ecc. xviij.° [25-26]

Þe Sixte Comaundement of God is þis /

Thou shalt do no lecherie.

Who breken þe sixte comaundement : ffornycaries. auoutrers. *and* holours. ¶ Whi ffornycaries : for þei defoulen her bodies *in* lecherie. as Tobie seiþ / þe deuel Osmodus sloow seuene men [7] for þei tooken not her wyf after þe foorme of clene wedloc ¶ Whi auoutrers : for

iij. c.° [8]

[1] Marginal insertion of " men ".

[2] *Ecc. iii. 6 :* " He . . . sones / *and* ", omitted in M ; " teriþ hem "—" teriþ þe fadir or moder ", M. EV uses the words " worshipiþ ", " terreth ". *Is. xxx. 9-10 1 :* " þat sein "—" sein ", M ; " speke "—" speke ye ", M. EV uses " not willende ", LV " nylen ". *Num. xvi. 27-33 :* not cited in M, which reads " for Goddis lawe tellith " ; " Dathan *and* Abiron / þat "—" þat Daton and Abiron ", M ; " wiþ al "—" and alle ", M.

[3] This and the sixth and seventh commandments agree with LV. Exod. xx. 14-15.

[4] Bühler cites St. Augustine on 1 John iii. 15, *PMLA*, lxix. 690, n. 19.

[5] Marginal insertion of " in tyme . . . pouert ".

[6] *1 John iii. 15 ; iv. 20 :* " ech man þat hatiþ "—" he þat is wroth to ", M ; " he is a lier ",—" is a lier ", M. *St. Augustine :* " is felowe "—" is made felowe ", M ; " to feendis "—" of fenndis ", M. *Ecc. xviii. 25-26 :* " *and* þe nede "—" and of þe neede ", M ; " fro erli "—" for fro eerly ", M. The translation is nearer to EV than LV.

[7] Marginal insertion of " men ".

þei breken þe hooli sacrament of matrymony. to whiche seiþ þe Wise Man / þe children of auoutrie þer seed shal be outlawid : *and* if þei ben of long lyf. at nou3t þei shulen be acountid *and* in þer last eende. þei shule faille speche [1] ¶Whi holours : for þei waasten her bodies vnkyndli. of whiche Poul seiþ / þis þing wite 3e wel. þat holours han not eritage in þe kyngdom of heuene.[2]

Sap. iij.° [16-18]

Eph. v.° [5]

þe Seuenþe Co[fol. 7v]maundement of God is þis / Thou shalt do no þefte.

Who breken þis seuenþe comaundement / michers. robbers. *and* extorconners ¶ Whi michers : for þei stelen priueli. as seiþ þe prophete Osee / truþe is not in erþe but cursidnesse *and* þefte. *and* mercie is awei *and* science of þe lord. for þis þing. alle þat dwellen þer inne shulen mourne ¶ Whi robbers : for þei robben opunli. to whiche seiþ God bi Isaie þe prophete / wo to þee þat robbist : wher þi silf shal not be robbid. whanne þou hast fulli robbid : þanne shalt þou be robbid ¶ Whi extorconners : for þei spuylen men of her goodis falsli. as þe Wise Man seiþ / þe vnpitous man seiþ. bigile we þe ri3twise man : for he is vnprofitable to us. *and* contrarie to oure werkis / bi moost foul deeþ condempne we him : *and* so proue we þe pacience of him.[3]

iiij.° c.° [1-3]

xxxiij. c.° [1-2]

Sap. ij.° [12, 20, 19]

þe Ei3tþe Comaundement of God is þis / [fol. 8r]

Thou shalt not speke fals witnesse a3ens þi nei3bore.[4]

Who breken þis comaundement ¶ liers. glosers. *and* false questmongers ¶Whi liers : for þei haten truþe. of whiche spekiþ þe Wise man / beter is a þeef. þan þe bisynesse of a lier : for boþe shulen eneritagen helle. ¶ Whi glosers : for þei hiden truþe. as seiþ Iseie þe prophete /

Ecc.ci xx.° [27]

[1] Marginal insertion of " *and* in . . . speche ".

[2] *Tobit iii. 8 :* " þe deuel Osmodeus "—" how þe deuel Asmodeus ", M ; " for þei tooken . . . foorme "—" for o woman. for þey token hir not in forme ", M. *Sa. iii. 16-18 :* " auoutrie þet seed shal " " avoutry schullen ", M ; " in þer last . . . speche "—" þe laste eelde of hem schal be wiþoute honoure and bileeue ", M. M translates verse 17 ; R moves to verse 18, the translation of which is closer to EV than to LV : " And if swiftliere thei shul ben dead, thei shul not han hope, ne in the dai of knouleching speche ", EV (" . . . nether alowyng in the dai of knowyng ", LV). *Eph. v. 5 :* " wite 3e wel "—" wite ye ", M ; " not eritage "—" noon eritage ", M ; " heuene "—" heuenes ", M.

[3] *Hosea iv. 1-3 :* " and mercie "—" mercy ", M ; " alle . . . mourne "—" shulen morne alle . . .", M. EV, " science, or kunnynge ". *Is. xxxiii. 1-2 :* " wher þi silf "—" whether thou ", M. EV, " whan thou shalt han ful endid robbing ". *Sa. ii. 12, 20, 19 :* " bigile "—" vigile ", M ; " he is vnprofitable " —" vnprofitable he is ", M ; " so proue we "—" priue we so ", M. EV rather than LV (cf. EV, " Bigile ").

[4] Exod. xx. 16 agrees with LV, except for " witnesse "—" witnessyng ", LV (" Thow shalt not spek a3ens thi nei3bore fals witnes ", EV).

þis peple is of hiȝ sermon. so þat we moun not vndirstonde þe sliȝnesse of her tunge in which is no wisdom ¶ Whi fals questmongers: for þei sillen þe truþe. as Isaie seiþ / Doom is turned backward. for truþe is fallun in þe street: *and* equite mai not go yn / *and* he þat ceesiþ fro synne: is able to be dispisid / [1] *xxx. iij.*[o] [19] *lix.° c.°* [14]

þe Nynþe *and* þe Tenþe Comaundementis ben þese /

Thou shalt not coueite þe hous of þi neiȝbore neþer þou shalt desire his wyf. not seruaunt. not hand [fol. 8v]maide. not oxe not asse: neþer alle þingis þat ben hise.[2]

Who breken þese comaundementis / þo þat wrongfulli coueiten in herte. þouȝ þei doen it not in dede. to whiche seiþ þe Wise Man / wole þou not coueite wickidli possessiouns. neþer folowe þou in þi strenkþe þe coueting of þin herte / it shal not profite þe in tyme of veniaunce / Also þo men breken þese two comaundementis: þat wrongfulli coueiten in herte. *and* to her power doen it in deed. for Crist seiþ bi Matheu / Eueri man þat seeþ a womman to couette hir: haþ now do lecherie wiþ hir in his herte / and also þei breken þese heestis þat han lust *and* likyng in such wrongful coueting. as þe Wise Man seiþ / vnstablenesse of coueting ouerturneþ þe witt without malice / Also Seint Iohn seiþ / þo þinges ben of þe world. couetise of iȝen. *and* lustis of fleish. *and* pride of lyf / [fol. 8v] and þese þre synnes: innwlappen alle oþer þat ony man doiþ.[3] *Ecc.*[ci] *v.°* [1-2] *v. c.°* [28] *Sap. iiij.°* [12] [1 Jn. ii. 16]

VI. Conclusion

It is hoped that the above materials may have imparted some sense of the vigour and ingenuity of the Lollard movement. The

[1] Eccles. xx. 27: closer to EV than to LV. "Betere is a thef than the besynesse of a man lier; forsothe bothe shuln eritagen perdicioun", EV ("customablenesse of a man", "a leesyngmongere", LV). The quotation does not occur in M, which gives "Deedis of Apostles. xxj. c°". The Rylands quotation is more in keeping with the commentaries in both *LFC* (L) and the Wyclyfite tract. *Is. xxxiii. 19:* closer to EV than to LV. "... puple of heiȝ sermoun, so that thou mowe not vnderstonde the sleeynesse of his tunge. ..." EV ("hiȝ word", "the fair speking", LV). The quotation does not occur in M ("Tymothe. iiij. c°"). *Is. lix. 14:* "Doom ... backward"—"turned is bacward doom" M, EV; "able to be"—"deemed worthy to be", M. Closer *passim* to EV than to LV.

[2] Exod. xx. 17 agrees with LV.

[3] *Ecc. v. 1-2:* "coueite wickidlie"—"wrongfully coueite", M; "neþer folowe" "ne folowe", M; "it shal not ... veniaunce"—omitted, M. *Mt. v. 28:* "wiþ hir"—"bi hir", M. *Sap. iv. 12:* closer to EV than to LV. "vnstablenesse of coueiting ouerturneth wit withoute malice", EV ("coueitise turneth ouer the", LV). Quotation absent in M. *1 John ii. 16:* "For al thing that is in the world, is coueitise of fleisch, and coueitise of iȝen, and pride of liif", LV.

constant inclusion in Wyclifite manuscripts of the quite orthodox *Pater Noster*, the composition of works like the Rylands *Ten Commandments*, all illustrate the Lollard's strong moral sense, his belief in the Law. But it is difficult not to be equally impressed by the skill with which the Lollard managed to insinuate his heretical doctrines into highly pious and conventional works. With the possible exception of Archbishop Thoresby, Richard Rolle seems to have been his most distinguished victim. In Rylands English MS. 90, for instance, one finds only two works : Richard Rolle's *Prycke of Conscience* and the virulent Wyclifite *Pater Noster*. No finer tribute was ever paid to the effectiveness of the Wyclifite reviser than the indignant lines prefixed to Richard Rolle's *Psalter* :

> Copyed has þis Sauter ben of yvel men of Lollardry,
> And aftirward hit has bene sene ympyd in wiþ eresy [1]

[1] Arnold, iii. 3.

FRANCIS THOMPSON: 1859-1907 [1]

By F. N. LEES, B.A.

SENIOR LECTURER IN ENGLISH LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
I fled Him, down the arches of the years;
I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
Of my own mind; and in the mist of tears
I hid from Him, and under running laughter.
Up vistaed hopes I sped;
And shot, precipitated,
Adown Titanic glooms of chasmed fears,
From those strong Feet that followed, followed after.
But with unhurrying chase,
And unperturbèd pace,
Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,
They beat—and a Voice beat
More instant than the Feet—
"All things betray thee, who betrayest Me."

I pleaded outlaw-wise . . .

—and so continues the most widely known and most warmly cherished poem of Francis Thompson, student from 1878 to 1884 of Owen's College later to become the University of Manchester; a poem written soon after the termination of his three years of almost unrelieved down-and-outness on the streets of London and one which has, surely, been endowed with a melodramatic glamour due to an over-ready, over-simple relating of its plangent remorse to a period of life felt as somehow fascinatingly sinful.

That the young man who so spectacularly surfaced from the social depths—an event due to his own literary gifts as well as to the responsiveness and kindness of Wilfrid Meynell, editor of *Merry England*—that this young man should have been an opium addict is, of course, what powers the switch for melodrama. By this the poem has gained something indeed; but it has also lost: so too the poet, who was, in fact, strikingly *not* quite an Ernest

[1] A Centenary Lecture delivered at Manchester University on Tuesday, the 8th of December, 1959.

Dowson, a Verlaine, or any other of the late nineteenth-century poets " under a curse ". Even those least willing to concur in T. S. Eliot's distinction between " the man who suffers and the mind which creates " will be willing, I think, to agree that a poem is a *poem made*, not an actual confession overheard. St. Augustine says " And lo, You at the heels of those who are fleeing from you, God of Vengeance and yet Fountain of Pity, turn us back to Yourself in wondrous ways ". It should need on more than this reminder of the antiquity of the central idea of " The Hound of Heaven " to warn us against too specific an alignment of biographical with poetic events. The glimpses of an outcast's life in London, too,—of one afoot both night and day, trudging under or sheltering beneath the city's arches, wandering in its labyrinth and through its mists—are there as *imagery* not as *scenery*; not as what is described, but as a way of describing.

The poem deals with a flight from God, and what we know of Thompson's life before he encountered Meynell (which is really much less than it at first appears) would lead us more confidently to locate this " flight " in the poet's period of indisputable moral dereliction, namely, the six years spent as a medical student at Owen's College; and who can say how long before, too, from when at the age of eleven he went from his home in Ashton-under-Lyne as a boarder to St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, intended there finally to attain ordination as a Catholic priest? He was rejected for orders because of temperamental unsuitability to a demanding, practical life, because of, to quote the authorities, " his strong, nervous timidity " and " a natural indolence which [had] always been an obstacle in him ". It is stated by his biographer that " he betrayed no singular piety "; and though it was held by some near to the family that his disappointment was crucial in his life, there would seem to be no real evidence against the conjecture that in his understanding of a reluctance to be wholly " caught " by the Divine Pursuer he could draw on experience so far back in youth as to confound any detailed autobiographical identification. The poem is *not*, after all, a repentance for iniquity so much as a statement of the incompleteness of earthly, human satisfaction.

At any rate, a dreamy retiring youth, clearly no sociable extrovert and equally plainly one of little assurance or moral courage, he entered the Medical School here in 1878, not long after it had been amalgamated with the College. The Medical School was built in 1874. The College had moved from Quay Street to its vastly more splendid new buildings (those which surround the present quadrangle, minus the Whitworth Hall and Christie Library block) in 1873 : and aesthetically unsatisfying as these edifices may be to a present-day viewer, they cannot justly be convicted of a power to dismay invincibly in 1878 even a sensitive ex-seminarian. Fr. Terence Connolly of Boston, Massachusetts, the great collector of Thompsoniana, writes as follows of his visit to England in 1938 : "Ashton-under-Lyne has the flavour of a highly romantic and beautiful name. I had always thought of the place as one to which Thompson was happy to return from Manchester, and where his poetic nature could gain a grateful respite from the medical studies he loathed . . . my first real impression of the town was rather disillusioning. . . ." Ashton in 1878 would not be as Ashton in 1938 ; but it is fair, I think, to see in Fr. Connolly's remarks something typical of that uncautious thinking so readily promoted by any poet with peculiar appeal for a particular group, in this case Catholics (of whom the present speaker acknowledges himself one).

One learns from Everard Meynell that Thompson was so repelled by his medical studies (it was a physical repulsion, he himself told Scawen Blunt) that he continually cut classes, to read poetry in the Public Library, visit the Art Gallery or, in appropriate season, watch the cricket at Old Trafford. One learns, too, that it was not until four years had passed, and the examination had been failed a second time (or not attended), that his father approached the authorities and discovered his son's truancy. Yet, it may be worth noting, a regulation of the time states that " a daily record is kept of the attendance . . . in the lecture-rooms " and promises that " absences will be reported to the Principal, who will, at his discretion, cause the same to be notified to the parent or guardian of the defaulting student ". Thompson is listed as a student in all the University calendars of those years, with attendance for most terms credited to him.

And there had been a genuine long illness in 1879 during which he was introduced to opium, in the form of laudanum (then both cheap and common), and during which his mother had given him a copy of De Quincey's *Confessions*. Thus began the addiction which accompanied him for most of his life, the cure effected by his stay with the monks of Storrington after the meeting with Meynell proving quite impermanent. Thompson was constitutionally delicate, emerged from his London years of deprivation so weakened that a doctor pronounced that " he would not live " and that to deny him his laudanum would be to "hasten his death ", and when admitted to hospital shortly before he died was found to have only one lung and that diseased, and to weigh only 5 stone. It must be emphasized that the adoption of the drug in no way entailed the sort of sinister, squalid depravity that readers of fiction, of my time, at any rate, associated with it. There is not the slightest evidence for linking Thompson with " the large unseemly bed " in " the meanest and closest of small rooms " on which Dickens's Jasper, in *Edwin Drood*, came to, to find himself alongside " a Chinaman, a Lascar, and a haggard woman " ; buying laudanum was not frequenting opium-dens. For much of his life the drug seems to have been serving some degree of medical purpose ; yet it is not surprising to find in the opening stanzas of " The Poppy ", the at least partly sentimental poem addressed to the fifteen-year-old Monica Meynell, something strangely out of tone with the rest of the poem :

> Summer set lip to earth's bosom bare,
> And left the flushed print in a poppy there :
> Like a yawn of fire from the grass it came,
> And the fanning wind puffed it to flapping flame.
>
> With burnt mouth, red like a lion's, it drank
> The blood of the sun as he slaughtered sank,
> And dipped its cup in the purpurate shine
> When the Eastern conduits ran with wine.
>
> Till it grew lethargied with fierce bliss,
> And hot as a swinked gipsy is,
> And drowsed in sleepy savageries,
> With mouth wide a-pout for a sultry kiss.

There is a violence here, a sinister glare, that suggests a fearful fascination rather than what the flower ought, one feels, gently

enough to evoke in such a context. I am not wishing to avoid condemnation but only sensationalism in speaking thus of Thompson's addiction.

The *Manchester University Magazine* of December 1907 has the following in its " Personal Notes " : " The death of the poet Francis Thompson has revealed the fact unknown to many of us, that he was at one time a member of the Owen's College Medical School. It is strange how little we know our own famous men. None knew that we had produced a famous popular novelist until Gissing died, and now with the death of Francis Thompson we realize that a famous poet has been in our midst. Perhaps it is that neither of these literary men passed a long and pleasant time amongst us, for both departed early to pursue their own whims untrammelled by the discipline of a large foundation, and never appeared prominently in the life of those who crowded in their footsteps, to whom they might have been a source of inspiration. Both hurried to London, and there both found reputation gilding the bitterest hardships and vicissitude."

This judgement, which smacks so much of a bygone age—the University now displays a commemorative tablet carved by Eric Gill, in the same corridor as the Bursar's Office—this *sober* judgement indicates apparently accurately the lack of mark made by Thompson on university life. Unlike Gissing he seems not to have contributed to the college magazine ; neither published index nor the relevant issues of it reveal his name. Gissing, of course, had had the good fortune a year or so earlier to take the English Literature course (given by Professor A. W. Ward on Wednesdays and Fridays from 3.30-4.30, " *History of English Literature from Chaucer to Spencer (inclusive)*". Certainly it is hard to see how Thompson can be shielded from such disapproval as is evident in the comment I have quoted, ill-informed though the columnist was ; for even after the disclosure to his father, the following two years of study (which again culminated in failure) showed only a part reform.

There followed then two briefly held jobs in the district, a rejection on medical grounds for the army, and the sudden running-away to London with a Blake and an Aeschylus in his pocket. Before leaving Manchester he wrote home for his fare

and it was sent. He was to see his father only once afterwards, though the father showed later, it would seem, unusual sympathy. His mother had died in his second year at college; a sister, Mary, subsequently Mother Austin of the Presentation Convent, Manchester, later maintained some slight touch with him by mail. Mother Austin, incidentally, died only four years ago and the present Reverend Mother, to whom I am much in debt for help in preparing this lecture, makes it clear that though Mother Austin considered Francis to be very much of "a cross" to her, and one from blame in which her father must be wholly exempted, she none the less believed that had the mother been alive he would never have left home.

Then came the hapless poverty of London, the charity shown to him by the street-girl—the equivalent of De Quincey's Ann, Thompson's account of whom has recently been accused of an exaggeration influenced by De Quincey's account; the temptation to suicide narrated by Thompson to Meynell, but also since accused of elements of literary fantasy; and the finding then of permanent care and attention at the hands of Meynell and his wife, Alice, herself a Catholic poet of much prestige.

A stay of a year or so arranged for him in 1889 at the Premonstratensian monastery in Sussex made free the energy or (perhaps, in the absence of laudanum) tethered the mind of the unquestionably dedicated poet, and Thompson there wrote that paeon of thronging images, the "Ode to the Setting Sun", an astonishing production to have met the anxious and hopeful eyes of his friends. Testimony, certainly, of recovered strength; promise, surely, of poetic force, the more certain when followed closely by the remarkable essay on Shelley, well-known now as a showpiece of "poetic" prose, but refused by the *Dublin Review* until after its author's death.

The "Ode" certainly speaks of powers and its echoes of Shakespeare, Coleridge, Milton, to name no more, witness to intimate and retentive acquaintanceship with the great poets; but the echoes remain echoes and attain no new being, and repeatedly though the eye is attracted to various parts, the poem by its very grandeur of scale the more repels participation. One admires the manner in which the quiet "Prelude" swells into

the body of the " Ode ", deepening in tone and widening in range, flooding the mind as the setting sun floods the sky, then dwindles in the " After-strain " to complete the rendering, as it were, of the process of sunset. One warms to particular phrases and passages—

> Who lit the furnace of the mammoth's heart ?
> Who shagged him like Pilatus' ribbèd flanks ?
> Who raised the columned ranks
> Of that old pre-diluvian forestry . . . ?
> . . . The tiger velvet-barred,
> The stealthy-stepping pard,
> And the lithe panther's flexuous symmetry.

—to this, for instance, derived from Blake's " Tyger " though it be. But persistent *forcing* of language to revivify familiar conceptions, a forcing that can be demonstrated in instance after instance of largely adjectival heightening and rhetorical insistence, blunts the poem's edge and bruises the reader's mind ; and the proliferation of fanciful conceit and hyperbole completes the breakdown in effect. And this, of course, very much because the poetic elaboration is beside the point of and superfluous to the argument of an argumentative poem, namely that the Sun is the type of the crucified and resurrected God of Christianity ; an argument which loses force (without biographical support) by the very splendour of the address to the Sun in comparison with the sombre acknowledgement of the victory of the Cross, and the only slightly touched-in gentleness of Our Lady's intercession.

> Even so, O Cross ! thine is the victory.
> Thy roots are fast within our fairest fields ;
> Brightness may emanate in Heaven from thee,
> Here thy dread symbol only shadow yields.
>
> Of reapèd joys thou art the heavy sheaf
> Which must be lifted, though the reaper groan ;
> Yea, we may cry till Heaven's great ear be deaf,
> But we must bear thee, and must bear alone.

And Mary replies :

> " Lo, though suns rise and set, but crosses stay,
> I leave thee ever," saith she, "light of cheer."
>
> " 'Tis so,"

acknowledges the poet :

> yon sky still thinks upon the day,
> And showers aërial blossoms on his bier.

It is in the long run the insufficiency of a large conceit for serious argument; and it is perhaps no wonder that a certain Canon T— asked the editor of *The Tablet* "what was the ode all about?" He couldn't in the least understand, but even if he had understood, he was quite sure it was not a thing to have appeared in a Catholic magazine! A poem of strong and versatile art, but as Wilfrid Meynell himself said, "deformed by violence of diction", and, I suggest, mistaken in its idea of the relation of sensory effect to logical argument.

It has of late been argued that the Sun in this is really Thompson's beloved opium, seemingly about to depart from him. Perhaps it may be accounted grace in me by any who should disapprove of my view of the "Ode" that I at least would deny the propriety of such an interpretation.

Thompson's ready fancy emerges again in the poem to the Meynell's baby, Francis, his godchild—the invitation to be godfather witnessing amply, one would think, to the trustworthiness of Alice Meynell's later description of him as "the most innocent of men"; with which her daughter Viola, in quoting it, agrees. I use the word "fancy" with Coleridge's meaning, as something inferior to "imagination". In this poem, though—very much the "occasional" one, there is a certain point and propriety in it, in its formal—may I say?—*wit*; for Thompson is by no means always so solemn as he may seem: there is very often in him a flavour of a "wit" dealing in the abrupt and direct conceit which is most reminiscent of the poets of the earlier seventeenth century; he writes, for instance, to the lady of "Love in Dian's Lap"—the poetess, Alice Meynell:

> Ah! let the sweet birds of the Lord
> With earth's waters make accord;
> Teach how the crucifix may be
> Carven from the laurel-tree,
> Fruit of the Hesperides
> Burnish take on Eden trees,
> The Muses' sacred grove be wet
> With the red dew of Olivet,
> And Sappho lay her burning brows
> In white Cecilia's lap of snows!

The metre and rhythm in this poem, of course, have numerous seventeenth-century ancestors, among them Crashaw, a Catholic

too, for whom Thompson had a very great admiration; who, oddly, seemed to him to show the flowering of the Metaphysical school of poetry—which he, again oddly, saw as "trying for a range": while Shelley was "the range found". If one can think oneself back into Thompson's position in the Romantic Movement's later days, one can see, I think, what he means, and realize that, though his taste and demands were not those of *our* time, there is in the Shelley essay, with all its imaginative expansiveness, a line of penetration firmly held, which may prepare us for the coherence and critical sureness of hand in much of his later criticism.

The period of recuperation I have spoken of saw the production of a number of poems which were to feature in his first volume, the *Poems* of 1893. Besides "The Hound of Heaven", in which imaginative expansiveness has a certain amount of free rein, there are, it should be remembered, signs of a sparer poet, more suggestive than declamatory. This, for instance, on "A Fallen Yew":

> It seemed corrival of the world's great prime,
> Made to un-edge the scythe of Time,
> And last with stateliest rhyme.
>
> No tender Dryad ever did indue
> That rigid chiton of rough yew,
> To fret her White flesh through:
>
> But some god like to those grim Asgard lords,
> Who walk the fables of the hordes
> From Scandinavian fjords,
>
> Upheaved its stubborn girth, and raised unriven,
> Against the whirl-blast and the levin,
> Defiant arms to Heaven.
>
> When doom puffed out the stars, we might have said,
> It would decline its heavy head,
> And see the world to bed.
>
> For this firm yew did from the vassal leas,
> And rain and air, its tributaries,
> Its revenues increase,
>
> And levy impost on the golden sun,
> Take the blind years as they might run,
> And no fate seek or shun.

But now our yew is strook, is fallen - yea,
Hacked like dull wood of every day
To this and that, men say.

Never !—to Hades' shadowy shipyards gone,
Dim barge of Dis, down Acheron
It drops . . .

—and so on. It is hard not to feel that here is a more resonant poetic voice. And one feels supported in this view by what Thompson told a friend not long after, during his five years or so stay at the Capuchin monastery, Pantasaph (from 1892 on); namely, that he had hitherto " fancied the end of poetry was in the stringing together of ingenious images . . . but that now he knew it should reach further and he hoped for an improvement in his future work ".

At Pantasaph were written the pieces published in 1897 under the title *New Poems* and dedicated to Coventry Patmore, with whom he there became very friendly ; and from whom he learnt much in respect of versification, in discussion with whom—and the monks—he advanced his religious thinking considerably. After returning to London in 1897, where he remained until the last year of his life, he seems to have written little verse except for commissioned occasional pieces such as that on the death of Cecil Rhodes in 1902.

It is in *New Poems* that we find his " Anthem of Earth," which seems to be a reply to Meredith's message of submission to Mother Nature in his " Earth and Man ". The reply is gloomy, though Christian, and carries a sombre feeling for death—which " doth the crevasse bridge / To the steep and trifid God ". It is an experiment with blank verse, and inevitably has often the flavour of Jacobean pastiche, but one notices a subdual of imagery to a defining purpose and an increased command over language and thought. In short, the poem seems to me to be an arresting testimony to developing powers, admitted none the less that its Christian purpose receives little positive expression beyond the turning of a post-Darwin sense of " Nature red in tooth and claw " into an attack on Nature-worship and rationalistic science :

I . . . nor thrust my arm in nature shoulder-high,
And cry—" There's naught beyond ! " How should I so,

That cannot with these arms of mine engirdle
All which I am ; that am a foreigner
In mine own region ? Who the chart shall draw
Of the strange courts and vaulty labyrinths,
The spacious tenements and wide pleasances,
Innumerable corridors far-withdrawn,
Wherein I wander darkling, of myself ?
Darkling I wander, nor I dare explore
The long arcane of those dim catacombs,
Where the rat memory does its burrows make,
Close-seal them as I may, and my stolen tread
Starts populace, a *gens lucifuga*,
That too strait seems my mind my mind to hold,
And I myself incontinent of me.

There is, besides, the " Orient Ode ", in the curious opening stanza of which—" Lo, in the sanctuaried East, / Day, a dedicated priest . . ."—the imagery seems to have displaced the object of its support ; thereby setting an interesting little problem for the critical Catholic reader. But one can only mention the " Sight and Insight " group, the " Ultima " sequence, and such a poem as " The Cloud's Swansong ", in all of which there is pleasure to be taken, in all of which fancy can be seen keeping her place and imagery handled more firmly ; but which still permit the frequent incursion of literary echoes, and (again, unless one applies the support of biographical interest) present the disinterested reader too often with the poet taking a somewhat Shelleyan, vatic attitude, and excessively brooding on himself. About this volume Thompson's own written comment was this : " From the higher standpoint, I have gained, I think, in art and chastity of style ; but have greatly lost in fire and glow. 'Tis time that I was silent. This book carries me quite as far as my dwindling strength will allow ; and if I wrote further in poetry, I should write down my own fame." The comment has truth in it : its conjecture must remain a conjecture ; though one should remember that there had been much critical hostility even to the first of his two volumes, of which he was well aware.

His remaining ten years of life, apart from a last brief spell in Sussex as the guest of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, were spent in London, always close to the Meynells, both physically and emotionally ; his long standing Romantic, unpurposive love for Mrs. Meynell offering no bar to happy relations with the whole

family. Annoying landladies by his inability to get up in the mornings, incapable of noticing the approach of an hour of rendezvous (he even missed his much-loved Monica's wedding by being too early and presuming it over); totally without desire of possessions ("at no time did he possess a bookcase, nor sufficient books to crowd the slenderest shelf", we are told), he seems to have lived a life much in key with the Franciscan one he admired. "Franciscan simplicity", an entry in one of his notebooks reads, "is dignified, because it is unaffected . . . . the Franciscan embodies in himself the poet's ideal, which is sensitive and candid self-realization and the spontaneous candour of a child combined with adult consciousness: while he has the natural amity towards his fellow-mortals which, in the case of the poet, is too often absorbed by egoism." Yet he did crave his laudanum and a regular portion of his scanty money went to provide what must by then have been strictly a medicine. It had, his last doctor affirmed, kept him alive in his last year or so.

Three adjectives used by Wilfrid Meynell, "frugal" "behindhand," "barren", to describe this way of life do not surprise—until one sees a fourth, "industrious"; his "frugal, behindhand, barren, *industrious* life"! The fact of the matter is that Thompson worked astonishingly hard in these years, as a contributor, chiefly of reviews, to the periodicals *The Academy* and *The Athenaeum* mainly; and it has been a loss, I think, that we should have had to wait until 1948 for a display of what he did. The prose volume of Meynell's standard edition contains only a few pieces, from which the Shelley essay has stood out for its, so to say, "poetic" prose; and it was not until Fr. Connolly, of Boston, published in New York his 500-odd page selection of Thompson's critical pieces that the picture was complete, or nearly so. The book,[1] it appears, is still virtually unknown in England. There are some eighty pieces in the collection, not one of which has been previously republished: most of them, originally unsigned, are now identified for the first time.

It would be foolish to look in a bygone critic for a taste and a set of judgements uniform with one's own, most of all with

[1] *Literary Criticisms of Francis Thompson*, ed. T. L. Connolly, S.J., New York, 1948.

regard to his contemporaries; one will not find such in any of the great critics. It is the temper of mind, the manner of approach, and the connectedness of judgements to a discernible centre of principle, that communicates value, rather than the opportunities of apparently checking one's score. Such value, I think, is offered by Thompson. Though I shall not suggest that he brought about or even attempted a revolution in criticism as did Wordsworth and Coleridge or T. S. Eliot, and though he quite obviously is a critic grown from Romantic seed in a Victorian climate, it is instructive to see him making an independent and clearly-motivated resistance to important trends in literary fashion:

On Ernest Dowson, for instance:

> . . . it may be doubted whether the most accomplished morbidity can survive the supreme test of time. In the long run Sanity endures: the finest art goes under if it be perverse and perverted art, though for a while it may create a life under the ribs of death.
>
> Yet with this great doubt, Ernest Dowson's work makes a present and delicate appeal to a generation itself sick of many ills. Not always of special originality or individuality, it is always dainty in form, finished in diction, and perfect in literary taste, with a sensitive avoidance of violence or exaggeration. . . . It is altogether poetry of feeling, one might well-nigh say of a single feeling, or cast of feeling. . . . Dowson sings in many poems of a frail grace, sweetness, and slender completion of form. But the central defect of power keeps him still a lesser poet—a poet of the bitten apple, without the core of fire which made Rossetti, for instance, far more than a lesser poet. And, then, too, unlike Rossetti, he has no brain, but just pure feminine sensibility.

Or consider the quite differently toned piece on the then popular, now forgotten poet, Lewis Morris. He reviews Morris's *A Vision of Saints* and quotes the blank verse description of Fr. Damien's death without verse lineation, to reveal it as, precisely, prose. He continues:

> [Meanwhile] . . . the poet has got hopelessly beyond us. Father Damien has undergone the second martyrdom for which he was resurrected, and Mr. Morris has concluded the volume with a select assortment of tinned Saints, packed layer on layer like sardines in his demulcent numbers. Let us, therefore, in lieu of further criticism, give the reader a receipt which, with a little practice, will enable him to prepare visions of Saints for himself. You wish to describe, we will say, a Saint's youth—a female Saint for choice, because that is prettier. First you set the thing down in prose—somewhat like this:
>
> > She remained solitary, absorbed in ecstatic contemplation, while the girls of her own age were running about the fields, or dancing to rustic music.

This, however, you can, if you like, copy *verbatim* from the nearest life of your Saint: but the next process is most important. You select from the best authors two or three passages to be worked in, which must, of course, correspond to the divisions of your own prose passages—thus:

SOLITUDE

His soul was like a star, and dwelt apart.—*Wordsworth.*

MAIDENS DANCING

Or on spring-flowered lea
Spread a green kirtle to the minstrelsy.—*Keats.*

RUSTIC MUSIC

To the jocund rebeck's sound.—*Milton.*

Now chop fine, flavour slightly with Tennyson, and serve with a garnish of the same poet.

She dwelt ecstatic, lonely as a star,
While her girl-peers would on the flowery lea
Run races with the wind, or to the sound
Of flute and rebeck blithe their kirtles flaunt
In hue the arum, where its stem's dusk green
Holds spousals with the white.

We really feel tempted to compete for the Morresque succession. But, perhaps, on that throne there will never be another Louis le Grand. And his motto is or ought to be, "*la Philistie, c'est moi*".

We have written in jest: we find it difficult to conclude in jest. It appears to us a blot on English letters that this man, who performs for the Laureate the office which the organ-grinder performs for our opera, should have received a critical applause one tithe of which has never been bestowed on fine living poets.

He could write like this about Andrew Marvell, this time in a piece I have myself hunted out in *The Academy* of 1905:

If there be any fault to find with Mr. Birrell's book, it is that he has hardly given adequate space to the consideration of what, when all is said, constitutes Marvell's one, indefeasible title to the name and rank of Man of Letters—his poetry, pastoral, imaginative and political, as distinguished from his later satirical verse. As a poet, Marvell shows affinity with several of his contemporaries: with Donne he revels in subtle imagery and the play of recondite conceits; with Vaughan he shares the passion for Nature, though the beauties he paints with Dutch minuteness are those of the pleasance rather than of the wilderness; while in consummate choiceness and propriety of word and phrase he approaches, if he does not actually rival, Herrick. This *curiosa felicitas* he derives from Horace, to whom he is also indebted for his skill in the poetical treatment of political themes.

The pieces range widely in subject—Leslie Stephen, Bunyan, for instance, Dryden, Burns, Daniel and Drayton, Carlyle, Tennyson, Courthope's *History of English Poetry*, Montaigne, Yeats, Poe,

and so on: he even reviewed, intelligently, Henry James's *Golden Bowl*. Fr. Connolly's collection is a most interesting and awakening one: let me close my selection with the comments on Matthew Arnold in a review of Frederick Harrison's essays:

"Dramatic passion", "tumultuous passion",—not these, as Mr. Harrison regretfully supposes, does Arnold need. Wordsworth had them not, and yet soared into regions of which Arnold but desirously dreams. It is inspiring emotion, the solemn passion, intense in its still ardour, appropriate to intellectual poetry, which Arnold needs. It is really passion of the intensest order, deceptively calm through its equipoise with the weight of thought. The calm which results from the careful husbanding of effort may imitate it with the multitude, but can never deceive the elect. In the main, Arnold reaches only this latter calm; and that Mr. Harrison should identify it with that inspired tranquillity and impassioned peace of Wordsworth (at his highest), the supreme Greek poets, and Dante, shows that Mr. Harrison—as we say—has not the keenest edge of poetic sensitiveness.

That is why Mr. Harrison feels that Arnold, though faultless, is "not of the highest rank". It is a misnomer, in fact, to call such poets faultless, whether it be Racine or Arnold, when in line after line there is the blot of absent inspiration, when there is not the only possible word in the only possible place. The greatest of all faults in a poet is to lack poetry, and that is theirs. At the same time Mr. Harrison does not, perhaps, lay sufficient stress upon Arnold's occasional success in touching the mark at which he aimed. The austere and noble sonnet on Shakespeare, with other brief achievements of the kind, are worth more than long poems full of fine thought, but only now and again inevitable in expression. For they are integral; and it is that quality which makes for permanence. Mr. Harrison (in this influenced by Arnold himself) is too apt to set store by detached lines and passages, which poets of no high power can often forge in tolerable quantity, to the great comfort of reviewers who pant for "quotes". He ignores too much the supreme value of relation and organism. Thus he depreciates, justly enough, the quality of Arnold's metre; but the reason he alleges is quite unconvincing and inadequate—namely, that Arnold has lines containing harsh collocations of consonants. The same could be alleged against Shakespeare, could be—and has been—alleged against Milton. Lowell rightly replies that metre may aim either at melody or harmony; that while the former demands smoothness, the larger music of harmony not only admits but makes use of occasional roughness, as discords have their function in the harmonies of music proper. To cite these individual lines of Arnold's, disjoined from their relation, proves nothing. Yet Mr. Harrison is right in his judgment, though defective in his reason: Arnold was lacking in metrical power, though he could strike out fine imitative music in occasional passages. . . .

. . . If we doubt his forecast of an extended future for Arnold, it is because we think his aloofness from the many is due to more than his mere distinction and those other fastidious causes set forth by Mr. Harrison. Arnold as a teacher was pre-eminently undecided (to use an adjective thrown out by Mr. Harrison

himself). A teacher of delicate incertitude, a watchman who has no word of the night, a prophet who disclaims prophecy, and

"Whose only message is that he sees nought,"

is never likely to have acceptance with the many who still, as of old, ask for a sign. And even among the few his cultivated stoicism and half-complaisant, half-melancholy indecision is scarce likely to be the fashion of the future. Even the cultured and sovereign few now begin to cry for a gospel and a hand from the cloud. But that constant reference to conduct, which Mr. Harrison rightly adjudges his dominant note, will doubtless secure to him long his measure of influence with the practical Saxon mind.

There is to be seen throughout these pieces the most sure handling of practical prose. It is natural and it is educated; it has style, in the best sense of the word. Yet it was mostly written in the harassed conditions of reviewing. There is shown, in brief, a mind as clear as the editor of *The Academy*, Lewis Hind, said it was; there is an active positiveness, and a spirit of service which does not entail critical servility. The fact that Thompson developed no original system of literary theory seems to me to count for little.

Biographically, this new aspect has something further to suggest, I think: that the positiveness of mind now shown may be good ground for seeing something like an intention in the poet's seemingly inert way of life. If, as I suggested at the start, "The Hound of Heaven" *poetically* gains strength from the only doubtfully legitimate incorporation of *particular* biographical suggestion into its imagery, it loses thereby a perhaps higher standing as a more general spiritual meditation and its force as a clue to the *positive* adoption or at least acceptance of a life of abnegation, which I conjecture to have been submitted to in something like penitence for earlier errors. If it is a little less as *poetry* to coerce the poetic participation of the indifferent reader, it is the more as *meditation* to illuminate the reader not indifferent: this on the strength of the reading of the poet's life I have today proposed. So, too, with others of his poems that I have not mentioned; for none, I think, reaches the poetic maturity that his gifts promised, and many go no farther than a "devotional", "hymnal" stage, offering merely a form of words for the reader's private devotional self-expression. I see no trace of truly "mystical" experience in his poetry or his life; and his attempt to create such in "The Mistress of Vision"

seems to me to be vitiated by the very elements of " Kubla Khan " and of Edgar Allen Poe that contribute to its appeal.

The poem " In no strange land " was found among Thompson's papers after his death :

O world invisible, we view thee,
O world intangible, we touch thee,
O world unknowable, we know thee,
Inapprehensible, we clutch thee !

Does the fish soar to find the ocean,
The eagle plunge to find the air—
That we ask of the stars in motion
If they have rumour of thee there ?

Not where the wheeling systems darken,
And our benumbed conceiving soars !—
The drift of pinions, would we hearken,
Beats at our own clay-shuttered doors.

The angels keep their ancient places ;—
Turn but a stone, and start a wing !
'Tis ye, 'tis your estrangèd faces,
That miss the many-splendoured thing.

But (when so sad thou canst not sadder)
Cry ;—and upon thy so sore loss
Shall shine the traffic of Jacob's ladder
Pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross.

Yea, in the night, my Soul, my daughter,
Cry,—clinging Heaven by the hems ;
And lo, Christ walking on the water
Not of Gennesareth, but Thames !

Although in this poem Thompson made a considerable poetic stride, there are, I think, finer poems—and *religious* ones—in the English language ; and as it is a direct affirmation of a proposition it must always be open to the impediment of intellectual disbelief. There *are* literary standards—which are *literary* standards ; and literary values are important. But they are not the only ones, nor are they wholly decisive ; and this poem, resting on the poet's life as I have seen it, must retain a special value of its own ; a value fitting to the man who wrote in his notebook the following : " After the Return to Nature, the return to God. Wordsworth was the poet of the one. I would be the poet of the other."

SOME RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES REFLECTED IN THE HEBREW NOVELS OF THE PERIOD OF ENLIGHTENMENT

By DAVID PATTERSON, M.A.
COWLEY LECTURER IN POST-BIBLICAL HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

MODERN Jewish history largely consists of a desperate attempt to catch up with Western European civilization, for in many respects the Jewish Middle Ages extend to the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The institution of the Ghetto in the middle of the sixteenth century resulted in a stagnation of Jewish life for some 250 vital years, during which the countries of Western Europe experienced an enormous expansion of horizons, both geographical and intellectual. From the end of the eighteenth century in Western Europe, and the middle of the nineteenth century in Eastern Europe, the Jewish people was faced with the formidable task of telescoping into a few decades a process of development which Western European countries had undergone slowly and painfully during two and a half centuries. Small wonder then, that Jewish life was thrown off balance. The unity of Jewry in the Middle Ages, so largely self-contained and soberly integrated, was shattered by the impact of the Modern World. A glittering panorama of fresh ideas and aspirations exerted a powerful attraction on successive generations of youth, so that many of the old ideals were all too rapidly abandoned in a search for the new and tantalizing values of the outside world. Enlightenment and emancipation gradually became the watchwords of large sections of the Jewish people, and if these concepts were not always compatible with traditional Judaism, then the latter had to be modified or reinterpreted to bridge the gap.

The struggle for civil rights and equality of opportunity found its first concrete expression in the writings of Moses Mendelssohn, and particularly in his *Jerusalem* (1783). In an

attempt to harmonize his Judaism with the rationalist philosophy he had imbibed from the *Aufklärung* on the one hand, and his patriotic aspirations on the other, Mendelssohn was compelled to define Judaism as a series of positive and negative injunctions untainted by any suspicion of dogma.[1] By arguing that Judaism leaves its adherents free to *believe* whatever reason and conscience dictate providing only that the practical commandments be observed, and by adopting the maxim "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's", Mendelssohn prepared the ground for a series of interpretations which were to empty Judaism of its national and social content. Yet so powerful were his own reputation and personal influence that almost a century was to pass before his ideas were seriously challenged from within the ranks of the exponents of enlightenment, who had hitherto regarded Mendelssohn as their spiritual ancestor.

In Germany itself attention was focused upon the problem of integrating the Jew into German society. Within the movement for religious reform, strenuously propagated by such thinkers as Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim, the urgent desire to accommodate Judaism to the demands of loyal patriotism resulted in the abandonment of the Messianic ideal and the hope of miraculous redemption. But the elimination of the eschatological aspects of Judaism gave rise to another problem, which has continued in large measure to the present time, namely: In what form was the continuation of Jewish life to be envisaged? This problem was by no means confined to the movement advocating radical religious reform. The counter-reformation of the Conservative movement advocated, among others, by Leopold Zunz, Zachariah Frankel and Solomon Judah Rapoport, and the movement of Neo-orthodoxy as represented, for example, by Samuel David Luzzatto and Samson Raphael Hirsh, are characterized by an equal awareness of the changed conditions facing Judaism, which demanded a re-thinking of the traditional position. Each thinker in turn propounded his own solution to the problems facing Judaism, but the very variety of opinion only serves to emphasize the process

[1] See D. Patterson, "Moses Mendelssohn's Concept of Tolerance", *Between East and West* (London, 1958).

of fragmentation to which Judaism was subjected in the course of the nineteenth century. One positive factor did, however, emerge. The continuous search for precedent in ancient practice to bolster the variety of opinions successively proposed fostered a growing awareness of the national past, and strengthened the sense of historical continuity. Hence the paradox that a move originally designed to limit Judaism solely to its religious aspects eventually helped to prepare the ground for a nationalist revival.

In Eastern Europe the drive towards emancipation and enlightenment began rather later and proceeded far more slowly. The great majority of the Jews of Europe were concentrated in the Russian "Pale of Settlement" where very different conditions prevailed. There the density of settlement, the all-pervading intensity of Jewish life and the hostility of the Russian Government seriously impeded the propagation of such ideas in the first half of the nineteenth century. But in Eastern Europe, too, such writers as Nachman Krochmal and Isaac Baer Levinsohn [1] gave expression to their awareness of the new conditions facing Judaism. From their penetrating studies in Jewish history they succeeded in focusing attention upon many aspects of Judaism, particularly its dynamic qualities, which had been neglected or become fossilized in more recent times. No less than in the West, although in very different form, the exponents of enlightenment in Eastern Europe followed the dual tendencies of reform and increasing national consciousness.

The more liberal climate which prevailed in the first fifteen years following the accession of Czar Alexander II, and which allowed the Jews of Russia more economic freedom and wider educational facilities, emboldened the exponents of enlightenment to press their views with greater vigour. Following the lead set by the Russian literary critics of the "Positive" school during the sixties of the last century, the younger Jewish exponents of enlightenment embarked upon a serious campaign for the amelioration of social conditions—but in this instance as

[1] For a succinct outline of the attitude towards Judaism adopted by these thinkers and their younger contemporaries see Y. Halevi-Zweik, *Musag Ha-Yahaduth Bi-Tekuphath Ha-Haskalah* (Tel-Aviv, 1955).

applied to Jews. Their shafts were aimed primarily against the prevailing system of Jewish education and the economic occupations favoured by the Jews; but at the same time they felt convinced that religious reform constituted a necessary step in the struggle for enlightenment and emancipation. Admittedly the reforms advocated seem negligible in the light of the radical changes introduced by the Reform movement in Germany. Nevertheless they aroused a wave of indignant opposition from the orthodox.

This opposition was neither new nor unexpected. Indeed, an intense antipathy on the part of the orthodox towards any attempt to spread enlightenment in any form had manifested itself in Russia for more than half a century previously, and the comparatively few exponents of enlightenment had frequently suffered ostracism and sometimes persecution. The orthodox regarded the new trends with the greatest suspicion, believing—and not without reason—that the spread of enlightenment without emancipation could lead only to conversion. Now, however, the situation was aggravated by the great increase in strength on the part of the enlighteners, both numerically in consequence of the new access to the High School and University and also—deriving from a conviction that the Government was behind them—in morale. Their criticisms of the orthodox position became sharper and more outspoken and their demands for reform increasingly compelling. The orthodox, for their part, took up the cudgels with avidity, at the same time hardening still further an attitude already rigid, and determined to defend their position to the last.

Although destined to continue in virulent form for at least another decade, the battle for religious reform reached its climax in Lithuania between the years 1869-71. In great measure this proved to be a literary war, a veritable battle of the books, largely fought out in the pages of the Hebrew literary journals, the most influential organ available to Hebrew writers for the propagation of their ideas at that time. Principally through the pages of *Ha-Meliz* and the less radical *Ha-Maggidh* the reformers, notably M. L. Lilienblum and J. L. Gordon, hurled their broadsides against the orthodox citadels, while their opponents

thundered back replies mainly via their own special journal, *Ha-Lebanon*. The battle centring upon the question whether Judaism should be reformed to meet the demands of life was fought with virulence and passion, often degenerating into a series of scurrilous attacks, particularly on the part of the orthodox, against the writers of the opposing camp.[1]

The exponents of enlightenment did not, however, confine their attack to articles in the literary journals. They propagated their ideas in poems, in satirical dramas, and especially in the novel. For a period of some twenty years following the first skirmishes in this literary war echoes of the struggle resound throughout the pages of the Hebrew novel. The issues had, indeed, already been raised in Abraham Mapu's long novel of contemporary life entitled *'Ayiṭ Ẓabhu'a* (The Hypocrite),[2] but Mapu's approach was cautious and restrained. During the period under review, 1868-88, the gloves are frequently removed, enabling the novelists to hammer their opponents unmercifully. Almost all the major novels of this period are largely, if not primarily, social in content. But even the minor and very obscure novels, despite their frequently fantastic plots and unreal settings, scarcely ever lack a sense of social responsibility, and lend their weight to the struggle against what their authors considered to be the abuses of their time.[3]

Most interesting, perhaps, of all these novels, in so far as it represents the most faithful portrayal of the battle at its height, is the novel by R. A. Braudes entitled *Religion and Life*.[4] In an important preface to the second edition of this work Braudes is careful to point out that the first term in the title of his work, namely *Dath*, does not signify faith or religion in its ordinary sense, but in the special connotation of Judaism as codified in the *Shulḥan 'Arukh* (the last great codification of Jewish law

[1] For a detailed study of this literary war see G. Katznelson, *Ha-Milḥamah Ha-Siphruthith bein Ha-Ḥaredhim We-ha-Maskilim* (Tel-Aviv, 1954).

[2] Pt. 1, Vilna, 1858; pt. 2, 1861; pt. 3, 1864. A second edition containing all five parts was published posthumously in Warsaw, 1869.

[3] For a brief survey of the relative importance of the novels of this period see D. Patterson, "Israel Weisbrem", *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1 (January, 1959).

[4] *Ha-Dath We-ha-Ḥayyim*, Lemberg, 1876-7. The references in this article are to the second edition corrected by the author, Lemberg, 1885.

to become generally accepted). The significance of the title becomes immediately manifest. It was against what they considered to be the excessive stringencies of that code that the reformers had directed their stoutest shafts in the literary journals. Indeed the author declares specifically that he has chosen the novel form merely to make his chronicle of the events of those three years, when the struggle between " religion " and " life " engulfed the whole of Lithuanian Jewry, more palatable. Even more revealing is the author's preface to the third part of the novel, which was never completed. Here Braudes emphasizes that the purpose of literature is to increase the reader's awareness of life, and that he has couched his chronicle in novel form so that the reader may be enabled to review the events the more dispassionately. He proceeds to the remark that whereas in the first two parts of the novel he has allowed the plot to take the lion's share of his work, in the third part he intends to lay the main emphasis on his depiction of the actual struggle, so that the reader is warned of the many diversions from the story to be expected. Braudes's own standpoint may be gauged from the fact that he modelled the hero of his story, Samuel, on the above mentioned M. L. Lilienblum, one of the principal protagonists in the struggle for reform.

It is important to emphasize the fact that Braudes makes no criticism of religion as such. On the contrary his hero, Samuel, is himself a strictly orthodox and observant Jew endowed, moreover, with a deep sense of loyalty to his people and an ardent wish to devote his entire energies to their cause. The attack is levelled solely against a too stringent and over rigid interpretation of Rabbinical law, which the author believes does not accord with the dynamic principles of Judaism as they are reflected in the Talmud. For this reason the three issues which are selected to serve as examples in the course of the plot seem all the more peripheral to a religious controversy. But in each case the author is aiming at the alleviation of Jewish social misery, which stemmed primarily from the almost universal and crushing poverty of Jewish life in the " Pale of Settlement ", aggravated by the extraordinary increase in population throughout the course of the nineteenth century.

The first example concerns the tendency of the local Rabbi to take the negative view in cases where the ritual fitness of an animal slaughtered for consumption is subject to the slightest shadow of doubt. The story opens with a complaint that the Rabbi has condemned three cows one after the other in a single day, even though the butcher argues that in his opinion, based on forty years of experience, the third is fit for consumption. As a result the whole townlet is left without food for the Sabbath, while the butcher sustains a ruinous loss. Next day in synagogue the butcher dramatically interrupts the service before the reading of the *Torah* to raise the point once again, and Samuel takes his side against the Rabbi, denouncing the latter's tyranny. Samuel proves his point from the Talmud, while the Rabbi supports his own case from the *Shulḥan 'Arukh*. Meanwhile the congregation is astounded to find that two such authoritative works can contradict each other! The Rabbi, however, stands his ground, and accuses Samuel of heresy.[1]

The second example, too, is directed against the financial loss caused to the innocent victims of excessively rigid interpretation. A child dies in a house adjoining the courtyard of that occupied by Samuel's mother. As she and her neighbours have neglected to throw away all the water standing in their houses immediately after the death, all the food in their houses is pronounced unfit for consumption and, moreover, they are ordered to throw away all their cooking utensils and purchase new ones in their stead.[2] Once more Samuel attacks the decision on the basis of his own profound knowledge of the sources of Jewish law, and once more without success.

The third example is far more germane to the plot and revolves upon the question of the *Yabham*.[3] Rachel, one of the heroines of the story, has recently become a widow. Her father-in-law, Todros, had divorced his first wife under pressure from her relatives some thirty years previously, and left her pregnant. Since that time he has become so degenerate a drunkard that he cannot even remember the village in which his first wife lived.

[1] *Ha-Dath We-ha-Ḥayyim*, pt. 1, ch. 7.
[2] Ibid. pt. 2, ch. 6.
[3] See the *Mishnah*, *Yebhamoth*.

He is unaware whether she gave birth to a son or daughter, or whether the child is still alive. As the possibility exists, however, that the child is male and has survived, Rachel is refused permission to re-marry until her late husband's hypothetical step-brother has first waived his prior claim to her hand.[1] The unhappy plight of the unfortunate Rachel may well be imagined, and once more Samuel takes up the cause of the oppressed. It becomes obvious from these examples, however, that the type of reform envisaged in this novel constitutes anything but a radical attack on orthodox religion, but rather an attempt to purge it of what were considered excrescences quite out of line with its real spirit.

Braudes, indeed, devotes the first three chapters of the third part of his novel to an historical survey of the development of Judaism from the period of the Second Temple to his own times. He is at pains to point out how the different factions of Jewry have constantly oppressed each other, with the object of demonstrating how such persecution only serves to strengthen the opposing party. After outlining first the struggles between the Pharisees and Sadducees and then the Rabbinites and Karaites, Braudes proceeds to trace the steady increase in the number of ritual laws formulated in the Middle Ages and the parallel growth of the Kabbalah, both of which developments, in his opinion, served to oppress the Jewish people. Admittedly only a certain proportion of the Jews had to bear the yoke of the Kabbalah, while Rabbinical law weighed heavily upon the entire people. But whereas the latter embraced only the body, the Kabbalah dominated the mind, resulting in an even more rigorous servitude.

The real disaster for Israel, argues Braudes, occurred when Rabbinical dialectic became united with Kabbalah to form the *Shulḥan 'Arukh*. The situation might well have been alleviated by the efforts of Menassah of Ilya on the one hand and Israel Ba 'al Shem Tob on the other ; but both were frustrated by the opposition of the Gaon Elijah of Vilna, who prevented Zalman of Ladi from uniting the two great divisions inside Jewry—the *Mithnaggedim* and the *Ḥasidim*. In Braudes's view the efforts

[1] *Ha-Dath We-ha-Ḥayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 2 ; pt. 3, ch. 11.

of the Gaon of Vilna have been responsible for the increasing intransigense of the orthodox Rabbis which he sees as leading to the total breakdown of Judaism. The Rabbis, therefore, are the principal opponents of the men who desire to cleanse the religion of its accumulated dross.

The hero, Samuel, echoes Braudes's views. In the many serious discussions on Judaism, which form so important an element in this novel, Samuel argues—and the difference of approach from that of Mendelssohn is worthy of note—that Judaism is composed of both beliefs and ordinances. The Oral Law was primarily concerned with the latter, and much of it, in consequence, was dependent upon time, place and circumstance. It was, therefore, in the nature of the Oral Law to modify the ordinances when the conditions of life so demanded. But with the destruction of the Second Temple the Oral Law came to an end. For the Mishnah and the Talmud represent not Oral Law but Written Law! The very act of writing it down deadened the spirit of the Oral Law. Hence the Rabbis have sanctified the dead word and neglected the living inspiration of Judaism.[1] In answer to the objection that once any relaxations of Rabbinical law are allowed the great majority of the Jews will proceed successively to abandon the law altogether, Samuel argues that such a view misjudges the character of the people. In Samuel's opinion the basis of reform must reside in a conformity between religion and life. The absence of that conformity is responsible for the fact that in the large cities religious transgression has become the rule.

After outlining the burdens accruing from the accumulated mass of ordinances relevant, for example, to the Passover, the Sabbath and the Dietary Laws, Samuel expressed the belief that the Rabbis are empowered to alter even the rulings of the Talmud itself, let alone the later accretions, when the conditions of life demand it. His prime concern is that Rabbinical severity is increasing the already dreadful poverty, and cites the sufferings that followed the widespread famine in Lithuania in that very year as a typical example.[2] This latter scene, where the hero's feelings are expressed in almost lyric vein, represents in large

[1] *Ha-Dath We-ha-Ḥayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 8.
[2] *Cf.* G. Katznelson, op. cit. pp. 69 f.

measure the climax of the novel.[1] Nowhere in the Hebrew novels of this period is the case for religious reform argued with greater cogency and absolute conviction.

A little over a decade following the publication of *Religion and Life* Braudes published a second novel, also concerned with religious attitudes, under the title *The Two Extremes*.[2] By 1888, however, the ferocity of the struggle between the exponents of orthodox and reform Judaism as depicted in the earlier novel had largely worn itself out. Both factions viewed with horror the wholesale desertions from Judaism and the cold indifference to tradition displayed by such large sections of the new generation which characterized much of Jewish life in Russia in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. *The Two Extremes*, which from the point of view of artistry is undoubtedly the most mature novel in Hebrew literature before the appearance of the works of Mendele Mokher Sepharim, contains a very different message.

This novel, which has something of the flavour of Goethe's *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, depicts the strikingly different types of Jewish life obtaining in the great city of Odessa on the one hand, and a tiny Ḥasidic town symbolically named Sukkot (Tabernacles) on the other. The plot revolves upon the remarkable effect which each of these two entirely different environments can bring to bear upon an individual who has grown up in the other. Jewish life in Odessa is portrayed as highly cultured and urbane, polished and sophisticated—but cold and empty. Life in the small town, by contrast, is outwardly squalid and unprepossessing, with ignorance, bigotry and blind fanaticism rampant; and yet it is so rooted in tradition and so faithful to its own standards, that once the ugly exterior is pierced a warm, loyal and colourful society suddenly emerges.

Both environments furnish the novel with a hero, each of whom is accidentally brought into contact with the opposite milieu. In turn they succumb to the lure of a life which they have never known, and thereby provide the author with an opportunity to portray the virtues and vices of both worlds. Within the framework of his story Braudes castigates the emptiness

[1] *Ha-Dath We-ha-Ḥayyim*, pt. 2, ch. 15.
[2] *Shetei Ha-Ḳẓawoth* (Warsaw, 1888).

of Jewish life in the large Russian metropolis, its rootlessness, indifference to tradition and the frivolous habits of mind which it engenders. But while appreciating the warmth of Jewish family life in the small town, its piety and the idyllic calm which pervades its Sabbaths and Festivals, Braudes is equally at pains to lay bare its darker undercurrents of fanatical obscurantism, debasing superstitions and relentless persecution of all attempts in the direction of secular education. To Braudes the estranged exponent of enlightenment in the large city and the pious hypocrite in the small town are equally detestable. Indeed, the message unfolded in *The Two Extremes* is that religion and enlightenment must be combined in order to reach a middle way.[1] The best of both worlds must be carefully selected, and the unattractive and debased elements abandoned.

The *denouement* of the plot is engineered by a *deus ex machina* in the shape of an old long-lost grandfather from Vilna, who symbolizes in his own person a happy fusion of orthodox Judaism and secular enlightenment. This pleasing combination is presented to both heroes as a healthier subject for emulation than either of the two extremes which have captured their imagination hitherto. As the old man is, in addition, extraordinarily wealthy, not only is he able to solve the spiritual problems of his grandchildren—as both the heroes turn out to be—but he can also rescue them from their material dilemmas! But the issues are portrayed with far more conviction than the solution; and the reader is left with the impression that the remedy which Braudes offers may well succeed in individual cases, but is unlikely to meet with any widespread acceptance in the face of the forces of disintegration besetting Jewish life. The atmosphere even by that time was too heavily charged, while the pressures on the Jewish people, both external and internal, were too compelling for any counsel of moderation to win the day.

Braudes, of course, was neither the first nor the only novelist in this period to plead the middle way, although he does so with far greater skill than any of his contemporaries. Even such minor writers as J. I. Leinwand and B. I. Zobeizensky whose

[1] *Shetei Ha-Ḳeẓawoth* (Warsaw, 1888), pt. 4, chs. 44-6.

very ephemeral novels are replete with all the worst forms of melodramatic device and *cliché*, and whose fate has been a complete and well deserved oblivion, advocate this middle course in which traditional values are combined with enlightened views.[1] Zobeizensky, however, while opposed to any suggestion of irreligiosity, is also strongly in favour of reform.[2] The prolific writer of popular Yiddish novels, N. M. Sheikewitz, one of whose very few Hebrew novels falls within this period, is no less careful to defend the more positive aspects of the traditional religious approach,[3] and is equally scathing with regard to religious bigotry and the infringements of religious practice.[4]

One striking exception to the general respect for enlightenment even at the expense of certain aspects of orthodoxy exhibited in these novels may be found in a work by A. S. Rabinowitz entitled *'Al Ha-Perek*.[5] Although in the course of time the negative results of the movement of enlightenment came to be more and more clearly recognized, and served as a target for the attack of many writers, especially P. Smolenskin, no other novel of this period adopts so constant and devastating an attitude in this respect.

'Al Ha-Perek is the story of a " Rake's Progress ". But the rake, in this instance, is represented by a young man whose early traditional piety and naïve sincerity are gradually corrupted by the forces of a pseudo-enlightenment which lead him ultimately to ruin. The novel makes a powerful onslaught against the various evils accruing from the teachings of enlightenment, each of which the hero suffers in succession. At the same time his changing attitudes and behaviour are constantly compared unfavourably with the orthodox traditional modes of thought he has abandoned. His rapid degeneration is emphasized by the steadfastness of the pious teacher, Judah, who answers the hero's argument that reform is necessary to bring religion into conform-

[1] See J. I. Leinwand, *'Oseh Mezimmoth'* (Lemberg, 1875-6), pt. 1, chs. 5 and 12; and B. I. Zobeizensky, *Ahabath Ẓaddikim* (Warsaw, 1881), pt. 1, ch. 4.

[2] Ibid. pt. 2, ch. 21.

[3] *Ha-Niddaḥath* (Vilna, 1886), pt. 1, pp. 72 f.

[4] Ibid. pp. 52 f. and pt. 2, pp. 30 f.

[5] Warsaw, 1887.

ity with the demands of life by insisting that the real need is not for reform but rather for an increase in the knowledge of the *Torah*.[1]

The climax of the story is represented by the views which Daniel, an idealist, utters from his sick bed. Daniel is aware of the excrescences which have attached themselves to Judaism, but he is even more conscious of the follies perpetuated in the name of enlightenment and argues that it is Judaism as an entity in which the real virtues are to be sought. A complete appreciation of the ethical values residing in *Torah* however, can be acquired only from studying the sacred literature for its own sake and not with the view to earning a livelihood from it. Enlightenment, he admits, is important as a means of improving the economic conditions of the people and may even, perhaps, serve to purge the faith of certain tainted elements which have crept in. But it should never be regarded as a new ethical foundation for behaviour and belief, for only an authority that stands above criticism can perform that function. Meanwhile he is convinced of the paramount importance of observing all the ordinances.[2] As for a solution to the steady deterioration of the Jewish material position, Daniel argues that neither religious nor aesthetic theories can cope with a problem of such magnitude, and that he is in agreement with Peretz Smolenskin that only a return to the land of Israel can provide a remedy.[3]

Prior to an examination of the view advanced by Smolenskin which, after reform, constitutes the second major attitude to Judaism presented in the novels of this period, one further standpoint is worthy of note. Perhaps the most negative approach to traditional Judaism to be found in all these novels appears in S. J. Abramowitz's *Fathers and Sons*.[4] It is significant that this latter work ranks among the earliest of the novels chronologically. Although Abramowitz, too, on one occasion

[1] '*Al Ha-Perek*, Warsaw, 1887, pp. 57 f.

[2] Ibid. pp. 146 ff., and N.B. footnote in which the author states that after writing this section he has come across the same idea in an article by H. Oppenheim in *He-Asiph*, 1887, p. 260.

[3] Ibid. and see below.

[4] *Ha-Aboth We-ha-Banim* (Odessa, 1868). The novel is satirized by Rabinowitz in '*Al Ha-Perek*, op. cit. pp. 51 f.

argues for the middle path as outlined above,[1] the main emphasis of his novel lies in a biting attack upon all the darker sides of the traditional Jewish life of his time, namely its obscurantism, its excessive stringency, its hypocritical fanaticism and harsh bigotry. Although a common feature in almost all these novels, Abramowitz's satire against Ḥasidism is particularly virulent.[2] This attitude is all the more surprising because his later writings, published under the pseudonym of Mendele Mokher Sepharim, are characterized by a depth of understanding of Jewish life and an intense sympathy towards its sorrows unrivalled in contemporary Hebrew literature. It was Mendele who first perceived in its fullest sense that the root of Israel's problems in the " Pale of Settlement " lay in the grinding poverty of the vast majority of the population. It was Mendele, too, who finally renounced all factionalism to demonstrate the inner light of Judaism lurking beneath the repellant exterior it had assumed.[3] In *Fathers and Sons*, however, there are few traces of this later understanding. Apart from a rather stereotyped appreciation of the national past,[4] the only passage of real interest in this respect is that in which the author discourses on the strange riddle of Israel's transformation from weekday shabbiness to a sudden splendour on Sabbaths and Festivals.[5]

The most important novelist of these years, however, is Peretz Smolenskin, whose six novels [6] cover sixteen of the twenty years under consideration. One of the keenest thinkers of his time, Smolenskin kept his fingers closely on the pulse of Jewish life, shrewdly basing his conclusions on the lessons of experience. It is not surprising, therefore, that his writings present a variety of views ranging over the whole field of Judaism. Smolenskin

[1] *Ha-Aboth We-ha Banim*, p. 25.

[2] It is surpassed only in the novels of P. Smolenskin and B. I. Zobeizensky.

[3] See e.g. his story "Be-Yeshibḥah shel Ma'lah U-bhe-Yeshibḥah shel Maṭṭah".

[4] *Ha-Aboth We-ha Banim*, pp. 120 f.

[5] Ibid. pp. 123 f. This idea was later developed in the splendid allegory entitled *Susathi*.

[6] *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Ḥayyim*, 1868-70; *Simḥath Ḥaneph*, 1872; *Keburath Ḥamor*, 1874; *Ga'on We-Shebher*, 1874: *Gemul Yesharim*, 1876; *Ha-Yerushah*, 1878-84. These novels were first published in serial form in Smolenskin's journal, *Ha-Shaḥar*. The references in the following notes are to later and more easily accessible editions.

had himself passed through all the stages of Jewish intellectual development current in his time. Following the first naïve adherence to enlightenment as the panacea for all Jewish misfortunes, he experienced first a feeling of disillusionment and then a profound conviction of the utter bankruptcy of all such views before finally reaching the conclusion that only a revival of Jewish nationalism could ensure the continuance of Judaism. The reflections of these different attitudes are scattered throughout his novels. Both the major factions within orthodox Jewry—the *Mithnaggedim* and the *Ḥasidim*—are subjected to a searching scrutiny, and while the latter are made to serve as the prime target for his biting satire, neither party escapes the lash of his invective. All the abuses of Jewish life already referred to are time and again subjected to a withering criticism. Indeed so dark are the colours painted by Smolenskin that on more than one occasion even he, himself, seems shocked by his own virulence, and gives the reader to understand that the picture is after all not quite so black as it might appear from his descriptions.[1]

But at the same time he is no less aware of the positive values of traditional Judaism and its institutions, and frequently portrays its pious and even saintly aspects—the charm of its Sabbaths, the significance of its Festivals, its profound respect for traditional scholarship and the importance of its spiritual and ethical truths. If the novels contain numerous examples of wicked hypocrites masquerading beneath the guise of pious orthodoxy, they are no less replete with the renegade disciples of a false enlightenment, whom Smolenskin depicts with an even more withering contempt.

Acutely conscious of the negative results accruing from an uncritical abandonment of Judaism in favour of an only half-digested secularism, Smolenskin turns savagely on the movement whose ideals had formerly been his own. Particularly in the fourth part of his long autobiographical novel *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Ḥayyim* (*The Wanderer in the Paths of Life*) which contains some of the author's most serious views, Smolenskin launches a powerful attack upon the Berlin type of Enlightenment and especially its founder Moses Mendelssohn.[2] From

[1] See *Ha-To'eh be-Darkhei ha-Ḥayyim* (Warsaw, 1905), pt. 2, p. 64 and p. 266.
[2] Ibid. pt. 4, chs. 11 and 12.

many passages in Smolenskin's writing it becomes clear that he held Mendelssohn responsible for having stripped Judaism of its national elements, hence paving the way for the Jews of Germany to regard themselves as "Germans of the Mosaic Persuasion"—and similarly in the other lands whither Mendelssohn's ideas have spread.[1]

To Smolenskin the national and social aspects of Judaism were inextricably bound up with the religious element. There could be no separation of Judaism from the Jews as a people. By focusing attention on the individual Jew the movement of Enlightenment might well have succeeded in improving the conditions of certain Jews as isolated units, but it had done nothing to help the Jewish people as a whole.[2] The latter could be aided only by a revival of the national consciousness, to foster a spirit of integration with self-preservation as the goal.[3] But it was useless, Smolenskin argued, to look to the enlightened Jews of Western Europe for help in this direction. They had become too cold and indifferent, closing their eyes to the fact that the Jews are everywhere regarded as strangers. Moreover, conditions in Eastern Europe were entirely different, and made nonsense of the western ideas of enlightenment.[4]

Israel, Smolenskin insists, is primarily a people of the spirit, and that single factor is the source of its eternity. That, too, is the reason why both the people and the language are holy. The real essence of Judaism lies in its conception of the unity and incorporeality of God. Hence religious reforms are conceivable in the practical sphere, and indeed there is a clear need to reform the power of the Rabbis.[5] The beliefs, however, must remain immutable. In this way Smolenskin's attitude to Judaism embraces the concepts of both practical reform and ardent

[1] Cf. especially Smolenskin's long essay *'Et le-Ṭa'ath* (first published in *Ha-Shaḥar*, years 6, 8 and 9) in *Ma 'amarim, vol. 2* (Jerusalem, 1925).

[2] Cf. *Ha-Yerushah* (Petersburg, 1898), pt. 2, ch. 19.

[3] Ibid. ch. 14. Apart from Smolenskin and Rabinowitz, I. Weisbrem expresses strong national sentiments in his novel *Ḥa"y Aghoroth* (Eighteen Coins), Warsaw, 1888, pt. 1, pp. 124 f., where he advocates the practical colonization of Palestine in preference to the Messianism of the *Ẓaddiḳim*.

[4] Cf. *Simḥath Ḥaneph* (Warsaw, 1905), pp. 144 ff.

[5] Ibid. p. 38.

nationalism, thus forming a striking contrast to Moses Mendelssohn's approach.

One further aspect of these novels is worthy of note. Quite apart from the religious attitudes they reflect, they constitute a veritable treasure-house of information relative to the whole field of religious practice in the period under review. On the one hand they provide much evidence concerning the three major divisions inside Jewry in the nineteenth century—the *Mithnaggedim*, the *Ḥasidim* and the exponents of enlightenment (the *Maskilim*)—and the mental climate of their respective milieus. Adequate allowance, however, must be made for the deliberate exaggeration and caricature natural to tendentious literature. On the other hand they furnish a wealth of illuminating detail about the physical and material channels of religious life.

The reader is provided with intimate glimpses into the lives of choirboys, beadles, cantors and Rabbis, their functions and conditions of work, their stratagems and devices, as well as their significance in the overall framework of society. Again, he is taken behind the scenes of the three main institutions of Jewish spiritual life, the Synagogue, the *Ḥedher* and the *Yeshibhah*, and presented with an intimate and penetrating account of their strengths and weaknesses. He is led through the labyrinths of religious communal life, and shown the intricacies of administration, the means of enforcing discipline, the pattern of intrigue and the deep significance of the religious calendar. And finally he is introduced to a bewildering variety of superstition and folk-lore which throws much light upon the religious psychology of the time. These novels, in fact, for all their weaknesses, their literary inadequacies and didactic pedantries, yield considerable information concerning one of the most storm-tossed and strife-ridden periods of Jewish life, and one which has proved decisive for subsequent Jewish history.

THE RÔLE OF THE EARLY HEBREW PROPHET [1]

By EDWARD ROBERTSON, M.A., D. Litt., D.D.
LIBRARIAN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY; EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

IT is desirable, I think, to preface this lecture with a preamble in order to remind us of the situation, both political and religious, in which the early Hebrew prophets performed their tasks—and by the early Hebrew prophets I have in mind particularly those of the eighth century. It is important then to call to mind certain main facts and factors in early Hebrew history. The following thumb-nail sketch may suffice.

Scholars seem to be agreed that whilst the Israelite tribes entered Canaan by a circuitous route from the eastern side, Judah moved in from the south. There was continual dissension between the two groups. Their earliest religious centre, as is made clear by their traditions, was Shechem (the modern Nablus) with Mount Gerizim as their holy mountain and to them also God's dwelling place on earth still known to Samaritans as Beth-El (house of God). There the priesthood established itself, and there, as the Samaritan priesthood, it has continued uninterruptedly to this day.

The first event of major religious significance was a breakaway movement within the Shechem priesthood which led to the establishment of a rival sanctuary and a rival priesthood at Shiloh. This is made clear to us from Samaritan records. Shiloh produced Samuel, recognized by all conflicting parties as prophet and legislator, who united the tribes in an all-Israel confederation, created a monarchy, revised the Mosaic legislation to provide a constitution (in my belief substantially the existing Torah or Pentateuch) and prepared the way for the Jerusalem Temple. This was Yahweh's new residence on earth, and in fact a religious Canberra.

With the death of Solomon the new Kingdom of all-Israel was

[1] A lecture delivered in the Library series of public lectures.

disrupted through the ambition of Jeroboam with the backing of the Shilonite priesthood, and the perversity of Rehoboam. Not only was the political structure disrupted, but the religious structure was also violently torn apart. The abode of Yahweh was left as the shrine for only a section of his people, since Jeroboam set up a rival sanctuary, and a priesthood and ritual of his own choosing. Could anything be more grievous? The urgent, the indispensable thing, was the restoration of political and religious unity. The kingdom of all-Israel must be brought back in its fullness. How to effect this was the great problem. Attempts made to solve it come up for consideration in the course of the lecture.

An investigation of the phenomena of prophecy, so widely acclaimed as peculiar to the Israelite nation, ought to begin with the story of the Garden of Eden. In this beautiful parable we have the Hebrew view of the relationship between God and man. Man, although made in God's image, when first placed in the Divine Garden was a mere automaton. In the garden were two trees which supplied God with the food appropriate to Deity—*Reason* in the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, and *Immortality* in the Tree of Life. Man in his primary state, void of reason, almost as we have said, a senseless automaton, would not of his own accord have touched the fruit of either tree when forbidden to do so. He was of clay and it was not intended that he should partake of reason and immortality, which are of the stuff peculiar to Deity. But through the Serpent and the Woman he ate of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, thus, clearly contrary to God's intention, acquiring the divine attribute of Reason, and the power of choosing either right or wrong. His eyes were opened and he became as a god. Had he now managed to eat the fruit of the Tree of Life he would have acquired Immortality. Then he would have become in very truth a god, and hence a rival to God himself. This was prevented by his hasty extrusion from the Garden. But God was seemingly powerless to take from man the divine attribute thus filched. Man in respect of intellect shares divinity with God and is thus, so to speak, on the same footing. God cannot

control the free exercise of man's reason. Man is free to decide whether he will worship God, or whether he will reject him and worship some other deity. God finds it necessary to enter into bargains or covenants with man. God can, however, reward or punish him according to his behaviour. Man may reject God but he does so at his peril, and whilst fruitful seasons and happiness and prosperity reward a faithful body of worshippers, the faithless and apostate are subject to a wide range of afflictions.

In early Hebrew belief God dwelt in the heavens making contact with the earth on hilltops [1] on which at times he descended. God, of course, can make contact with man, since God and man have reason in common. It was not given to any and every man to hear the voice of God, only the select few whom God will choose to listen to his words and hear his message, and perform such service as he may require.

Just as gesture language preceded articulate speech, so the idea that a God could make his will known to mankind by signs was a belief widely current in the early world. We are familiar with the omens to which the Greeks and Romans had recourse in their anxiety to read the divine mind. The religious practices of the Babylonians and Assyrians took significant account of signs and developed a whole science of liver-reading and of the spread of oil on water. Joseph's cup, which found a lodging in Benjamin's sack, is thought to have been used for the latter form of divination. " When the King of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination, he shook up the arrows, he consulted the teraphim, he looked in the liver. In his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem." [2] Although the Hebrews made use of omens and signs and the casting of lots —as witness the ephod, the Urim and Thummim, and the teraphim to all of which there are repeated references—they did not find them sufficient for their needs, however satisfactory they might prove for Gentile nations. It was Israel's claim, made from the first and continued down the ages, that the nation stood

[1] Exod. xviii. 5; xxiv. 13, 15, 16, 18; Deut. ix. 15; xxxiii. 2; 1 Kings xix. 8; Ps. ii. 6; iii. 4; xv. 1; xxiv. 3; xliii. 3; lxviii. 15, 16; civ. 32; cxxi. 1; Heb. iii. 3, etc.

[2] Ezek. xxi. 21.

on a special personal relationship with its God. This is important for in respect of no other nation of the early world was the personal element in divine intercourse with man so prominent. It is true that amongst other nations their kings were held to be in a specially privileged position and occupied the throne because of divine favour. There is even the implied suggestion that the king by virtue of his position has a claim to divine favour and protection. Otherwise in general the gap between the divine and human was a wide and deep one. The Hebrews had no such gulf between them and their God. Their dealings with him through individuals specially singled out for the purpose, were personal and intimate. So much is this the case that even when their early writings speak of Yahweh making contact with his people through the agency of an angel the reader is made to feel that the angel is merely Yahweh himself in disguise. It was only later that the increasing sense of the transcendence of God made the recognition of a separate and distinct intermediary inevitable. But at Peniel Jacob wrestled with an angel and his name was changed to Israel for he had striven with God and with man and had prevailed.[1] Also of the same character is Joshua's interview with the captain of Yahweh's host near Jericho. The angel here gives the same instruction to Joshua, that Yahweh himself gave to Moses. "Put off thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy."[2]

Nothing but a feeling of personal contact with the divine, of verbal instruction from on high, of voice answering voice, could possibly satisfy such religious conceptions and aspirations as stirred so profoundly the soul of the Hebrew. It is no doubt true that the God of a people must reflect their national characteristics. To early seafarers their God must be a God of the sea. Neptune would have been incomprehensible as the God of a tribe dwelling in the Russian steppes. Christianity with its appeal to love and forbearance, to weakness and long-suffering could hardly have taken its rise save amongst a people downtrodden and oppressed. The Hebrew God, then, had to be one who in their eyes answered their needs and responded to their

[1] Gen. xxxii. 24 ff.
[2] Joshua v. 13.

innate qualities. The God of the Hebrews must be one with whom his people could enter into negotiations and make bargains. Such an intimate association could never have developed from, or have remained for long satisfied with, the indefiniteness and obscurity of omen communication alone, for omen reading in substance amounts to the god either nodding his head in agreement to a proposition, or shaking it in disapproval—no more than that. Not only did the Israelites discover, or perhaps re-discover their God when in Egypt, or rather were found by him, but with their own expanding religious sensibilities they became conscious of attributes in him which increased and widened with the years, until they realized him as supreme in the universe and its creator. They also recognized in him the inspirer of their moral impulses and the regulator of their thoughts and actions.

The Hebrew thus turned away, readily and eagerly enough, from dumb manifestations of the divine interest in him to seek direct association with his God. But in the sphere of personal intercourse there are also forms of communication which do not involve speech. Man's mind is subject to experiences which come to him enveloped in an aura of mystery which suggests divine interposition. Thus the dream which transports man to other scenes and surroundings may seem to him to be given for his guidance if only he could interpret it aright. But it is not given to everyone to interpret dreams, and wide is the range of the dream literature in the Semitic world. On one of the flyleaves or a Samaritan manuscript in this Library there is a register of lucky and unlucky dreams ; and in their modern literature the Samaritans claim to have been inspired to action on several occasions by dreams. I need not labour the point. We all know that dreambooks can be purchased in bookshops and at bookstalls round about us.

The vision is a stage beyond the dream in the direction of the divine. It may be said to begin where the dream ends. A dream may come to anyone, a vision comes only to minds specially attuned to receive it. And here we make contact with the prophet. We realize that in the case of a vision God selects the man. The vision appears to be an infusion of the divine mind which overawes and grips man's soul and cannot be gainsaid or

forgotten—as in the call of Isaiah,[1] or in Paul's vision on the Damascus road.[2] The intermingling of the divine and the human, which mankind recognized in the vision, was bound to have a disturbing effect on the mind subjected to it, and could be expected to produce strange psychic phenomena. The writer of the Book of Job has dealt with the dread effect on man of contact with the divine, toying with the subject in poetic fancy. Eliphaz the Temanite has come to the tortured and despairing Job, and hints that he has a message to him from the Almighty, who appeared to him in a vision of the night. The passage is one of the most uncanny in the Old Testament.

> Now a word was secretly brought to me
> And mine ear received a whisper thereof.
> With disquietings from the visions of the night
> When a deep sleep falleth on man.
> Fear came upon me and shuddering,
> Which caused dread in all my bones,
> Then a Spirit passed swiftly before my face,
> The hair of my flesh bristled up,
> It stopped—but I could not discern the appearance thereof.
> An apparition was before mine eyes,
> There was silence, and I heard a voicé saying
> Shall mortal man be more just than God?
> Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?[3]

Trance and ecstasy were the most widely recognized symptoms of divine possession. The classical example of this is Balaam's own account of himself "seeing the vision of the Almighty, falling down and having his eyes open",[4] and Muhammad's ecstatic trances are well known. Ecstasy, with its accompaniments is consequent on divine possession of the individual, not *vice versa*. It is not because a man is so constituted by nature that the divine emanation is enabled to enter, that he becomes a prophet. Yet a curious development in mental outlook is the conception that the divine influx can be invited or induced, as if divine possession were dependent on, and must await, man's pleasure—at least after the initial experience, when it is allowed that God makes the choice. Thus Elisha calls for a minstrel to arouse the ecstatic state so that the hand of the Lord could

[1] Isa. vi. 1 ff. [2] Acts ix. 3. [3] Job iv. 12 f. [4] Num. xxiv. 16.

come upon him,[1] and the prophets of Baal at Carmel cut themselves with knives with a similar object in mind.[2]

The Hebrew prophet was essentially a man chosen by God to act as his intermediary between him and man. As God's will and interest ranged widely over all the activities of his people, the task of the prophet was not confined to one particular channel. The idea of prediction as the main function of the prophet which lurks in our use of the word is founded on a misconception, fostered largely, no doubt, by the Greek word from which it is derived. It is true that at times, they uttered predictions, as when Isaiah rebuked Shebna and foretold his fate,[3] as when Jeremiah prophesied Hananiah's death,[4] as when Amos predicted the bitter future of Amaziah and his family,[5] and many more. But in all cases in which this phenomenon occurs, they are the so-called signs or tokens to prove that the speaker is a true prophet. He who would speak in Yahweh's name must submit proof of the possession of divine power. He must be able in effect to say " Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou moon in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still and the moon stayed." [6] Prediction of coming events was an obvious sign, since it was beyond the power of the ordinary man to forecast the future, and time would bring verification, or otherwise.

Such proofs offered freely by the prophets are adduced to support a claim which in each case is being challenged, or even derided either openly or by implication. The essentials of a prophet demanded the most careful scrutiny for the consequences of accepting and following out the message and consequent instruction and guidance, could be, and often were, very grave. Even the coming to pass of signs was not to be accepted as a sure proof in itself. You may recall the words in Deuteronomy, " If there arise in the midst of thee a prophet or a dreamer of dreams and he give thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he speaks unto thee saying ' Let us go after other Gods which thou hast not known and let us serve them ' : thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet or unto that dreamer of dreams : for the Lord your God testeth you to know

[1] 2 Kings iii. 15. [2] 1 Kings xviii. 28. [3] Isa. xxii. 15 f.
[4] Jer. xxviii. 16 f. [5] Amos vii. 9. [6] Joshua x. 12 f.

whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." [1] An additional test is the nature of the message which the intelligence of the hearer should enable him either to accept or reject. But in general the false prophet could not offer to the incredulous signs and wonders which would be fulfilled. The true prophet had the advantage of Yahweh working in and through him to bring all things to pass. Moses and Aaron had to convince Pharaoh by a series of wonders that their requests were supported by a divine power such as no king could hope to withstand.[2] Samuel, to convince the people, calls on Yahweh to send a thunderstorm in the middle of the wheat harvest [3]—an unheard-of thing. " As snow in summer and as rain in harvest, so honour is not seemly for the fool " says the Book of Proverbs.[4] You remember, too, when Isaiah was urging Ahaz to ignore the Syro-Ephraimite coalition, how he invites him to " ask a sign of the Lord thy God : ask it either in the depth or in the height above." [5] The prophets themselves usually determined the signs they offered. Here was, indeed, a challenge to Ahaz which none but a true prophet could have ventured to make. We are not surprised that Ahaz, fearful of being convinced against his will, declined.

The sign, then, is not of the essence of prophecy, but merely one of its externals, and prediction was not one of its necessary functions. Another widely spread view is that the prophet was a proclaimer, one who spoke before assemblies, maintaining that that is the proper meaning of *προφήτης*. It is in this sense it is urged that in Plato, *Phaedrus*, the poets are called the prophets of the Muses *Μουσῶν προφῆται*.[6] Here perhaps is the origin of the widespread conviction that true prophecy throughout the whole period of Israelite history had one common aim and purpose. This aim has been variously interpreted, but commonly it has been held to be to supply spiritual guidance to the people, and in general uphold the religion of the nation, evolving in the process the highest moral values. Their function has been summarized in the words " to act as the conscience of the nation " or " to preserve, extend, and spiritualize the Law ". This view has been

[1] Deut. xiii. 1 f. [2] Exod. vii. 1 ff. [3] 1 Sam. xii. 16 f.
[4] Prov. xxvi. 1. [5] Isa. vii. 10 f. [6] Phaed. 262 D.

neatly epitomized in the saying that prophecy was the heart-throb of Hebrew religion.

The aim of Hebrew prophecy as thus defined is admittedly a lofty one—one designed to promote the highest ideals of humanity. Yet to what extent is this view justified? Whilst raising the aim of prophecy to great ethical heights, it has also limited the scope of its function. There is no *a priori* reason why the servants whom Yahweh selected for divine possession should all be assigned the same common task. It would not be easy, e.g. to put Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Amos, and Deutero-Isaiah in the one category of spiritualizers of the Law without some ingenious dialectic and much juggling. We are apt to overlook the fact that when we look back up the path of history, as it leads down the ages, we find that the New Testament stands between us and the Old. The shadow of the New Testament falls on the earlier writings, and whilst we may permit that shadow to affect our outlook as far back as the time when the Hebrew nation became an ecclesia, we should not suffer it to affect our view of the years that lie beyond. It is our New Testament point of view which makes us restrict the *nebhī'īm* (or prophets) to the narrow class of spiritualizers of the Law and guardians of the national conscience. Nor ought we to place them at the end of a process of evolution beginning with the lowest forms of divination—forms which the healthy body of Hebrew religion outgrew and rejected one after the other—until it rose to highest things. There is abundant evidence that prophecy and divination existed side by side and were in evidence in all ages.

Are there then any distinguishing features, any common elements in the prophecy of different periods, as we know it, in the deeds and writings of the prophets of which we have knowledge. There are at least two features which have either been overlooked or not sufficiently stressed, neither of which deals with the specific function or task of the prophet. Both deal with the *occasion* for his selection. Firstly, there is a specific task of danger and difficulty affecting the fate of the nation. Secondly, almost invariably there is a theophany at the time of the " call " of the prophet. The fact that there is a theophany at all shows the supreme importance of the task as well as its danger, and

magnitude. Obviously God does not manifest himself to man in a theophany unless for very special reasons. It is not a casual every day happening. We will take some instances. You will recall Yahweh's appearance to Moses out of the midst of a burning bush at Mount Horeb. To Moses was assigned the task from which he shrank, of facing Pharaoh and bringing forth the children of Israel out of Egypt.[1] Or again take the case of Elijah. In the midst of Elijah's ministry in the northern kingdom, when his life was sought by Jezebel he took refuge at Mount Horeb and there in the cave where he lodged he experienced a theophany.

" Behold Yahweh passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains and brake in pieces the rocks before Yahweh, but Yahweh was not in the wind : and after the wind a rumbling but Yahweh was not in the rumbling : [2] and after the rumbling a fire : but Yahweh was not in the fire, and after the fire a still small voice and it was so when Elijah heard it that he wrapped his face in his mantle and went out and stood in the entrance of the cave." [3]

This was no ordinary thunderstorm. Yahweh had come to hold converse with Elijah. The wind, the rumbling and the fire remind us of Ezekiel's vision by the Cheber when Yahweh's hand was upon him, " I looked and behold a stormy wind came out of the north, a great cloud with a fire unfolding itself ".[4] Similarly Daniel's vision bursts upon him with the noise of the four winds of heaven breaking forth upon the great Sea, and he was soon to behold the Ancient of Days, whose throne was fiery flames and the wheels thereof of burning fire.[5] To Elijah the wind, thunder and lightning were not Yahweh, but his forerunners. He follows them, " and after the fire a still small voice ". Yahweh had come to him in person, and Elijah must go forth to meet his God with his face hid in his mantle lest he gaze on him and perish. The significance of the theophany is that Elijah is to be sent on a dangerous mission which included the anointing of Hazael to be

[1] Exod. iii. 1 f.

[2] *ra'ash* rattling of war chariots in Jeremiah (xlvii. 3), the jumping wheels of chariots in Nahum (iii. 2) and the stamping of horses' feet in Job (xxx. 24).

[3] 1 Kings xix. 10 f. [4] Ezek. i. 4. [5] Dan. vii. 2 f.

king over Syria,[1] and later, through Elisha, Jehu to be king over Israel.[2] Of the gravity and danger of this task there can be no two opinions. It involved the fomenting of rebellions in both these countries and the overthrow of their governments. Micaiah Ben Imlah, a prophet of less note, had a vision amounting to a theophany which he recounted to Ahab and Jehoshaphat as they sat on their thrones at the entrance of the gate of Samaria. He saw Yahweh as a king on his throne with his courtiers around him. To him was assigned the dangerous task of foretelling Ahab's death to his face.[3] Similarly Isaiah's vision heralded a dangerous mission not to proclaim ethical monotheism at street corners, where the danger would have been practically non-existent, but on a dangerous mission to the Northern Kingdom where part of his prophetic activity appears to have been exercised.[4]

Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel experienced theophanies. Jeremiah sees Yahweh putting forth his hand and touching his mouth to consecrate him for the dangerous task of being Yahweh's mouthpiece in denouncing the nations for their wickedness, shown in their neglect of him.[5] Similarly Yahweh speaks to Ezekiel, who is overcome by the vision of his God in awful splendour,[6] and Ezekiel, too, is fortified for the dangerous task assigned to him from which he shrinks back dismayed. We can now appreciate the significance of Amos's retort to Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, " I was no prophet, nor prophet's son, but an herdman and a dresser of sycomore trees, and Yahweh *took me from following the flock*, and Yahweh said unto me, ' Go, prophesy unto my people Israel '".[7] There must have been here a theophany, the scene the lonely hillside : the Hebrew shepherd alone with his God. Micah too, must have had some experience of the divine which left a deep impress upon him. " But I truly am filled with power by the spirit of Yahweh and of might to declare unto Jacob his transgression and unto Israel his sin." [8]

It has been said that although prophecy began with Moses, with Samuel it appears in all its splendour. Samuel you will

[1] 1 Kings xix. 15. [2] 1 Kings xix. 16 ; 2 Kings ix. 1 ff.
[3] 1 Kings xxii. 19. [4] Isa. vi. 9 f. [5] Jer. i. 9 f.
[6] Ezek. ii. 3. [7] Amos vii. 14. [8] Mic. iii. 8.

remember was visited by Yahweh when but a youth in the temple at Shiloh. He was called thus early to a great task the importance of which it is difficult to overestimate. The advent of Samuel found the Hebrew tribes from Dan to Beersheba and beyond, occupying the hill-country with the Canaanites subdued, but suffering from the incursions of that well-equipped and remorseless foe, the Philistines. The tribes formed two factions, the South or Judahite group and the North or Israelite. That these two groups had separate individualities and variant forms of worship seems to be well established. Before Samuel's day in the period of the Judges the first stirrings towards union of the tribes as a whole were manifest when expeditions against them by Canaanites and Midianites especially led to joint action for the time being. There can be no doubt that the bond which united them was their worship of the same God and the root cause of the disagreement between the two groups, the diversity in the forms of worship employed. Samuel appeared at a time when union was in the air and when the relentless pressure of the Philistines forced it to the front. We are told he was recognized throughout the length and breadth of the land as a prophet. "And all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord."[1] Although himself an Ephraimite, and thus originating from the Israelite group of tribes, he exercised leadership and consequently judicial functions in the southern group as well. He went from year to year "in circuit to Bethel and Gilgal and Mizpah, and his return was to Ramah".[2] His sons, Joel and Abijah, were judges in Beersheba.[3] We see the political union of the tribes being forged before our eyes, and when it came to the setting up of a monarchy, Samuel not only anointed the king, but framed the constitution for the united kingdom, thus we are told: "Then Samuel told the people the *mishpaṭ* of the kingdom and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord."[4] *Mishpaṭ* here is better translated legal code or "constitution". On the political side he thus achieved a great work and on the religious side he was no less successful. In the days when Samuel

[1] 1 Sam. iii. 20.
[2] 1 Sam. vii. 15 f.
[3] 1 Sam. viii. 1 f.
[4] 1 Sam. x. 25.

was a child, we learn that the word of Yahweh was scarce, and there was no " open vision ".[1] But whatever this meant it fell to Samuel to publish Yahweh's name abroad. He it was who prepared the way for the Jerusalem temple. It is foreshadowed where we are told, in the second chapter of the first book of Samuel, that a man of God came to Shiloh to Eli and gave him this message from Yahweh. " I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind : and I will build him a sure house : and he shall walk before mine anointed for ever. And it shall come to pass that every one that is left in thine house shall come and bow down to him for a piece of silver and a loaf of bread and shall say, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priest's offices that I may eat a morsel of bread." [2] This is intended to be a foreshadowing of the centring of worship in the temple at Jerusalem involving the abandonment of Yahweh's former shrine at Shiloh when the priests of other shrines will have to make their way to the new temple at Jerusalem to get a post and earn their living. Whilst the *political* unification of the tribes was rendered not merely desirable but imperative, because of the Philistine threat, the religious unification must have been a task of enormous difficulty and great delicacy. There are no scruples so difficult to overcome as religious scruples, and although the " word " of Yahweh Sebaoth was precious in those days, there were in existence presumably other " words ". Yet we have some inkling of how Samuel faced the difficult situation. He gathered round him men inspired by the same ideals and with the same attachment to the religion of Yahweh Sebaoth. They were the " sons of the prophets ". They shared in some mysterious way in the prophetic spirit which possessed Samuel. It was a recognized phenomenon in that age—as can be gathered from the Book of Numbers.

[1] 1 Sam. iii. 1. The Hebrew translated " open vision " is *ḥāzôn niphrāṣ* which really means " widespread vision " or may possibly but doubtfully be " mass vision ". If the former it might imply that the revelation of him had not been sufficiently known. Yahweh's writ so to speak, did not run through the length and breadth of the land. If the latter it might imply a form of " mass vision " such as was found amongst the prophetic bands, " the sons of the prophets ".

[2] 1 Sam. ii. 35 f.

There we are told of the seventy elders with whom the Lord *shared* the prophetic spirit of Moses, and who for the time being prophesied.[1] These " sons of the prophets " were presumably men who, so to speak, caught the infection since in Samuel there was a superabundant amount, as evidenced also in the case of Moses. In the case of Elijah, who likewise had attached to him bands of " sons of prophets ", the divine emanation even affected his garment. It was sufficiently strong in his mantle to part the waters of the Jordan.[2] Mass psychism or hysteria is as inexplicable as it is real. That the mass prophecy of the " sons of the prophets " was also infectious or contagious, was evidenced in the case of Saul who when he mingled with them exhibited the same symptoms as they did.[3] They formed in effect a *béth dīn* or law court. It may be that the prophet who was at their head, and who shared with them his prophetic spirit, was known as their " father " or Ab, which might explain the cryptic, " And who is their father ? " It was perhaps in this assembly that the Torah, as we have it, was shaped, but a consideration of that question would lead us away from our subject. It appears to be within the bounds of possibility also that Samuel may have employed the " sons of the prophets " to spread the knowledge of Yahweh Sebaoth of Shiloh throughout the tribes of Israel. They may have performed wonders in the name of Yahweh, as did the disciples of Jesus after they had received an infusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. The necessity for proclaiming the word of Yahweh abroad in the land at this time possibly accounts also for the change of the name from *rō'eh* (seer) to *nābhī'* (prophet). Slowly no doubt, but none the less surely, Samuel with the aid of the " sons of the prophets " carried through his plans for making the worship of Yahweh Sebaoth, with which from his apprenticeship at the Shiloh temple he was thoroughly conversant, the state-worship. His plans evidently included the new Temple. The prophet Nathan gave to David a message urging David to build a house for Yahweh.[4] Solomon carried it out.[5] It was not given to Samuel to see the full fruits of his labours in his lifetime, but he had the knowledge that he

[1] Num. xi. 24 f. [2] 2 Kings ii. 8. [3] 1 Sam. x. 10 ff.
[4] 2 Sam. vii. 4 ff. [5] 1 Kings v. 5 ff.

had planted and watered well. Samuel was a great and determined national leader who took hold of the reins of government at a grave crisis in the history of the Hebrew tribes. He was essentially a man of action fulfilling a specific task set him by his God. It was a task of an entirely different character from that assigned to Moses, but Samuel was as successful in his allotted task as Moses was in his. Samuel was truly a prince of prophets, but his "prophecy" lay in action. With the hand of his God upon him he could judge the tribes of Israel, re-edit the Mosaic teaching, found a kingdom, prepare the way for a national temple, hack Agag to pieces with his own hands. What had he in common with Deutero-Isaiah save the divine inspiration? Their tasks, their methods, their results are poles apart.

I have dwelt on Samuel's task more fully hoping to make you realize that when Yahweh chose his prophets it was not to invite them to preach good sermons to backsliding Israelites, but rather for leadership in national emergencies. The task was appropriate to the age and the conditions. Let us travel the path of history a short way downwards from Samuel. The culmination of Samuel's work was seen in the union of all-Israel under one king with Jerusalem as capital. The orthodox worship of the land was that of Yahweh Sebaoth, formerly of Shiloh, now installed in a great temple in Jerusalem, his dwelling place on earth. Yahweh had entered into a fresh agreement with the whole people. But not for long could the conflicting interests of north and south be reconciled. At the death of Solomon, north and south fell apart. Samuel's work was undone. Yahweh Sebaoth abandoned his earthly home and the statutes, commandments, judgements, and testimonies according to that which is written in the Law of Moses [1]—which David charged Solomon his son to keep—ceased to have the same binding force and the same interpretation in the north. The ten Israelite tribes and their new ruler reverted to the pre-Samuel worship of Yahweh, not necessarily that of Shiloh. Here there was, indeed, a national crisis, the gravity of which it would be difficult to overestimate. If Yahweh had need of prophets—it was never more so than now. Judah remained outwardly faithful, and both the national capital

[1] 1 Kings ii. 3.

and the national shrine were in her territory—or at least that of allied Benjamin. It is doubtful whether any Samuel could now have gathered up the broken threads. But in a supreme effort to restore union, political and religious, prophet after prophet arose in Judah. The greatest stumbling block to re-union was the separate kingdom in the north, and the prophets directed their energies to the task of overthrowing the political power in the north and setting on the throne an adherent of Yahweh Sebaoth who would lead the north back to Jerusalem.

As our conception of the task of the prophet is bound up with our reading of what happened at this time, let us examine the situation a little more closely. The attempt to restore political and religious union between north and south was a task entered upon from the time of the disruption and it was fraught with serious consequences for the Northern Kingdom. Its government became the prey of intrigues and revolutions involving assassinations and continual changes of dynasty. There is no secret made of the instigator of this state of unrest. Judah was the culprit. There was, of course, open war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam as long as Rehoboam lived. That was to be expected. Judah could hardly have looked upon the Northern Kingdom at this time as other than a defection of tribes from constituted authority—a revolt which had to be quelled. Rehoboam's grandson Asa even went to the extreme of enlisting the support of Damascus to foil the new kingdom.[1] See how active Judah was! How long was the family of Jeroboam permitted to exercise power? His son Nadab had barely time to seat himself on the throne (he reigned less than two years) before he was overthrown by an upstart named Baasha. Whence came the stimulus and backing of Baasha's revolt? Listen to the words of Yahweh to him, sent by the hand of the prophet Jehu the son of Hanani. "For as much as I exalted thee out of the dust and made thee leader (*nagīd*) over my people Israel, and thou hast walked in the way of Jeroboam", etc.,[2] concluding with the same curse on him as had been fastened on Jeroboam. The plain interpretation of these words is that Yahweh through emissaries (of whom the prophet Jehu was seemingly one) had fomented the rebellion of

[1] 1 Kings xv. 18 ff. [2] 1 Kings xvi. 7.

this Baasha, a mere commoner, and crowned it with success. Yahweh had raised him from the dust and made him a leader (not a king). Baasha had no qualifications for kingship beyond his success as the leader of a successful revolt. It was evidently expected of him that he would lead back Israel, i.e. the Northern Kingdom, to Jerusalem. But Baasha, having tasted power, was evidently not disposed to relinquish it and preferred to be ruler in the north rather than be demoted to become a subject of Judah's king in a re-united land. The wine of success had gone to his head and it entailed the grievous curse laid upon him. Baasha's house did not long endure. His son, Elah, had but two years of reign when he was assassinated by his servant Zimri, when drinking himself drunk in the house of his chamberlain.[1] Intrigue followed intrigue. Two rivals to Zimri arose in Tibni and Omri and the people who followed Omri prevailed. Tibni was probably the man Judah's emissaries were backing. Had it been Omri he would no doubt have been cursed with the curse of Jeroboam for disappointing Judah's hopes just as Baasha was cursed. Omri founded Samaria and the strength of the fortress no doubt gave security to the new dynasty.[2] Even with the house of Omri in a more stable state, the insidious attacks of Judah on the Israelite monarchy were continued through the intrigues of Elijah and Elisha. We have already seen how Elijah was called to his task of overthrowing the government of Israel (wherever Israel is spoken of at this time it means the Northern Kingdom as distinct from Judah). It was desperate work. He was driven from pillar to post, hiding by the brook Cherith, or taking secret refuge with the widow of Sarepta. Ahab had sought him far and wide (to ensure the withdrawal of the curse of no rain on the land). Ahab was so hotfoot against him that he sought him even in other kingdoms, making them testify on oath that he was not within their borders, thus making it clear that he would have demanded Elijah's extradition if he had been found harbouring amongst them.[3] Ahab's first words on meeting Elijah are significant of his attitude. " Is it thou, thou troubler of Israel? " Elijah in reply makes it clear that it was Ahab's departure from the commandments of Yahweh which was

[1] 1 Kings xvi. 9 f. [2] 1 Kings xvi. 9. [3] 1 Kings xviii. 10.

responsible for the national misfortunes.[1] And Elijah's instruction from Yahweh, following the theophany at Horeb, was to strike again at political authority by fostering rebellion, not only in Israel, but also in Damascus. It was a twofold revolution with Syria included—no doubt to prevent Ben Hadad, who had signed an agreement with Ahab after their indecisive struggle, from coming to his assistance when the revolt in Israel broke out.[2] Ahab was given by Elijah abundant proof of the power of Yahweh of Jerusalem, without avail, and on him too was fastened by Elijah the curse of Jeroboam.[3] Read a little farther on.

When Jehoram, Ahab's son and Jehoshaphat of Judah were joined with Edom in an expedition against Mesha' of Moab and the expedition was faring badly in the Edomite desert, the need for divine aid was felt. Jehoram expresses the belief that Yahweh is at the back of their misfortunes and has enticed the three kings in order to deliver them into the hands of Moab. He recognizes, of course, that he does not stand well with Yahweh. Jehoshaphat is loyal to Yahweh and repudiates the suggestion, asking if there is not a prophet of Yahweh available whom he can consult. He is reminded of the existence of Elisha and the three kings "go down to him". Elisha's reception of them is what might be expected of a fanatical opponent of the Northern Kingdom. He turns to Jehoram. "What have I to do with thee? Get thee to the prophets of thy father and the prophets of thy mother." But Jehoram reiterates this accusation of Yahweh, and implies it is Yahweh's prophet who must be called in question. Elisha is filled with scorn. "As Yahweh Sebaoth liveth, before whom I stand, surely were it not that I respect the presence of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, I would not look toward thee nor see thee."[4] Then later we have the command to Elisha to pour the vial of oil on the head of Jehu thus starting the rebellion which led to the downfall of Jehoram and the extermination of Ahab's house.[5] For a time it looked as if in his zeal for Yahweh of which he boasted, Jehu was presented with a great opportunity of achieving that re-union on which Yahweh's emissaries had set their hearts, for in addition to slaying Joram of Israel, he slew also Ahaziah of

[1] 1 Kings xviii. 17 f. [2] 1 Kings xix. 15 ff. [3] 1 Kings xxi. 21 ff.
[4] 1 Kings iii. 4 ff. [5] 2 Kings ix. 1 ff.

Judah leaving both thrones vacant. Athaliah, mother of Ahaziah and daughter of Omri, evidently looked upon it as a heaven-sent opportunity to annex Judah to the Northern Kingdom for she promptly destroyed the Judan seedroyal—with the single exception of Joash, her grandson. He slipped through her fingers to become the centre of Jehoiada, the High Priest's, party, and eventual king. To celebrate the escape of Judah from the fate that threatened her, the first thing Jehoiada did after he achieved success was to make a covenant between Yahweh and the king and people that they should be Yahweh's people.[1]

And so the tale goes on. Move and counter-move between Judah and Israel and not always to the advantage of Judah. Prophets continued to labour to effect a re-union on which the whole life-blood of the Hebrew nation depended. Of many of these prophets we know nothing, but of the eighth-century prophets Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah of Jerusalem we have, although probably not in original form, records of some utterances and some indication of activities.

Amaziah, the High Priest of Bethel in the Northern Kingdom, accused, not without very good reason, Amos of conspiracy against the House of Israel. He seeks to have him expelled from the country and warns him " O thou seer, go flee thee away into the land of Judah and there eat bread and prophesy there ". Amos reminds him that Yahweh had taken him from the flock to prophesy to his people Israel (the Northern Kingdom).[2] Amos in some of his recorded prophecies appeals to the Northern Kingdom to return to the worship of Yahweh of Jerusalem, Yahweh Sebaoth, " For thus saith Yahweh to the house of Israel, seek ye me and ye shall live, seek not Bethel, enter not into Gilgal, and pass not to Beersheba. Seek Yahweh and ye shall live lest he break out like fire in the house of Joseph ".[3] The golden calf worship which professed to be a worship of Yahweh he would not accept. " Though ye offer me your burnt offerings and meal offerings I will not accept them ",[4] and so on. So it is with Hosea. There is sorrow not unmingled with bitterness in Hosea's appeal to the Northern Kingdom. " Israel hath behaved

[1] 2 Kings xi. 1 ff.
[2] Amos vii. 10 f.
[3] Amos v. 4 f.
[4] Amos v. 22.

himself stubbornly, as a stubborn heifer." [1] "Ephraim is the cake not turned." [2] He is the silly dove without intelligence.[3] He is joined to idols, let him alone,[4] and so forth. But he crowns all with a wonderful passage of tender pleading for Israel's return to reunion with Judah.

"O Israel return unto Yahweh, thy God, for thou hast fallen by thy iniquity. Take with you words and return unto Yahweh. Say unto him, take away all iniquity and accept that which is good. So will we render as bullocks the offerings of our lips. Ashur will no more save us: neither will we say any more to the works of our hands. 'Ye are our Gods' for in thee the fatherless findeth mercy." [5]

Utterances revealing their efforts to restore the state of things before the disruption can similarly be gathered from Micah and Isaiah of Jerusalem, and we need not enlarge on them here.

The task of the Hebrew prophets from the time of the disruption to the fall of the Northern Kingdom and the passing into exile of its tribes, was to act the part of spies, intriguers, subversive agents, revolutionaries in the Northern Kingdom on behalf of Judah, or rather on behalf of Yahweh Sebaoth of Jerusalem. They took their lives in their hands. They ran the risks that are inseparable from such dangerous tasks. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews reminds us, the prophets "had trial of mockings and scourgings of bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned. They were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword. They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute afflicted, tormented . . . they wandered in deserts and in mountains and in dens and caves of the earth." [6] Such was their fortune or rather their fate —a fate that might be deemed not inappropriate even in modern times for subversive agents and all enemies to the safety of a state. Many were the tasks to which God called his prophets. It was only when the Jewish nation passed into exile, and the nation became an ecclesia that the moral aspect of worship became prominent. His prophets had then a different task. But with that we have at the moment no concern. Our interest and our task close with the early Hebrew prophet.

[1] Hos. iv. 16. [2] Hos. vii. 9. [3] Hos. vii. 11.
[4] Hos. iv. 17. [5] Hos. xiv. 1 f. [6] Heb. xi. 36 ff.

THE POET MARTIAL[1]

By W. H. SEMPLE, M.A., Ph.D.
HULME PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

AS I thought about a scheme for this lecture, my main difficulty was this. Here were 1,200 short poems, on many different topics and themes, but with no single co-ordinating plan. There is no unity in their variety: they preach no doctrine: they advance no cause: they are not related to any one end. The individual poems are separate entities; and, though massed together in books, they stand there as isolated units, without cohesion of subject or purpose. I am reminded of what the Emperor Gaius said of Seneca's writings: "harena sine calce" ("sand without lime"): there is no lime, no mortar, in Martial to bind the individual pieces into a cohesive whole; and this caused my difficulty in preparing to write about them. But, as I considered, there emerged three possible groupings of the poems which would supply some interesting material for my talk—first, some glimpses of how a poor man, a poet, lived at Rome in the first century A.D.; then, the surprising portrait of the Emperor Domitian that Martial presents to us; and finally, some account of his own methods, aims, and opinions as a man-of-letters. I shall have to quote a good deal, often in translation and in prose (for the verse translations are unsatisfactory): and I warn you that in translation the pointed sharpness of a Latin epigram is often blurred: but I shall try to quote pieces that are intrinsically interesting as well as useful for my purpose. And I may as well add that, in the 1,900 years since Martial lived, nothing of what I now say has failed to be said before.

Let me state at once that, if I now appear as a literary critic dealing with an ancient poet, I do not conceive a literary critic to be primarily or mainly a fault-finder. It is not his duty to come before you as an accuser or indeed as an advocate: his first duty is to exercise judgment—to discern between good and evil, I mean

[1] A lecture delivered in the Library series of public lectures.

literary good or literary evil, not necessarily moral. He must base his judgment on no predetermined doctrine : he must know thoroughly the time and milieu and intellectual atmosphere in which his author worked : he must judge the success of a book by its attainment or otherwise of its professed intention, with due allowance for the handicap of circumstances or personal conditions. I deprecate that type of modern criticism by which the author is put in the dock and subjected to a third-degree examination, and is often condemned for errors which are not typical or symptomatic. If errors are occasional and localized, they are no doubt regrettable but venial. If they are embedded in the structure of the work and endemic, then and then only are they significant. It is as much the duty of the critic to praise where he justly admires as to blame where he is justly indignant. In fact, good criticism is generally neither praise nor blame, but a mixture of both : for a book is a human document, not perfect, but in spite of human failings striving towards perfection. Martial himself puts it very well in a poem (I. 16) to his friend Avitus :

> sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura
> quae legis hic : aliter non fit, Avite, liber.

And when the censorious critic, Lausus, says (VII. 81) with heavy displeasure,

> triginta toto mala sunt epigrammata libro,

Martial makes the very apt rejoinder,

> si totidem bona sunt, Lause, bonus liber est.

The known facts of Martial's life are soon stated. He was a Spaniard, like several other distinguished men-of-letters at Rome in the first century A.D., Quintilian, the Senecas father and son, and Lucan : he was born about 40 A.D. at Bilbilis, a steel-making town in Hispania Tarraconensis in central north-east Spain. He was given a good education by his parents, that is, he had been to the grammarian's school to study language and literature both Latin and Greek, and to the more advanced school of the rhetorician to study oratory. He comments (IX. 73) on the folly of his parents in having him taught these literary subjects which

were never of any material advantage to him in making a living :

> at me litterulas stulti docuere parentes :
> quid cum grammaticis rhetoribusque mihi ?
>
> " My foolish parents had me taught the rudiments of literature :
> but what good are grammar teachers and rhetoric teachers to me now ? "

He came to Rome in the early sixties of the century, in the reign of Nero, and for thirty-five years he existed as a man-of-letters in the capital, under Nero, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva and Trajan, gaining such a livelihood as he could, and finally retiring to his native Bilbilis about 98 A.D. He lived there for a few years more and published from there his twelfth book of epigrams in 101 A.D. During all his time in Rome, he took no part in politics : there is barely a single political reference all through his works, though he does of course mention such public events as the Emperor's campaigns and triumphs. He was a man about town, poor, dependent on his own resources, making his way by his talent as a poet and by his faithful attendance as a client on rich patrons against whose meanness and grudging appreciation of literary merit he inveighs frequently. We have no knowledge of his first fifteen years in Rome. In 80 A.D. he published a collection of epigrams known as the *Liber Spectaculorum* to celebrate the opening of the Colosseum by Titus. He then published twelve successive books of epigrams, of which the first nine were published under Domitian : each book contains about 100 poems, some as short as a couplet, some quatrains, many of them twelve or fourteen lines long, some few running to twenty or thirty lines, mostly in elegiacs, iambic scazons, or hendecasyllables, the tone and style of the poems being mostly satirical and based on the epigrams of Catullus, whose disciple and follower in the art of the epigram Martial professed himself to be. He acquired a very considerable reputation ; in his own day he was much read, imitated, plagiarized, and criticized ; he was the maker of the epigram as we know it : he could justly be called the greatest epigrammatist of the world.

What has a perpetual social interest is the fact that Martial, a man without (as far as we know) inherited private means, lived for some thirty-five years at Rome and appears to have supported himself on the tenuous income derived from the relationship of

patron and client. Like many other freeborn Roman citizens, he depended on the small daily allowances which the wealthier men gave to those who attended them as clients—and from the hundred farthings, the "centum miselli quadrantes", which constituted the client's daily dole, there had to be paid his lodgings, his clothes, his amenities and comforts. The patron expected his presence at the "salutatio", the early morning levee in his house: the client had to rise early and make his way through the dark streets in order to be present punctually between six and eight o'clock. Then along with others he would accompany his patron down to the centre of the city, perhaps to the forum, perhaps to a literary reading, perhaps to the law-courts, the throng of clients in their formal togas giving importance to the movement of the great man through the streets. The morning's duties extended till nearly midday, and then the afternoon was given more or less to one's own pursuits. The picture that Martial gives us of patrons is not an attractive or pleasant one. All through the books of poems he attacks their churlish treatment of the clients from whom they have exacted such a continuous round of social duties. At the morning "salutatio" they are haughty and remote: at the dinner to which they sometimes invite a client they make a difference in food and drink—a fine menu for the lord and his close friends, an inferior meal for the client: sometimes they make him a gift of clothing, but not on any regular system, so that the formal toga in which he pays his official calls has become worn and shabby and needing repair, but he has no means of replacing it. The Emperor Domitian in his queer conservative way had tried to bring the patron-client relationship back to the old-time style in which it was formed by a genuine social protection which the patron extended to his poor dependants: at this earlier period there was no money payment, the client dined in the afternoon at the table of his protector: and Domitian had ordered a return to the original system, so that the "sportula", the "centum quadrantes", the money dole, had to be replaced by a regular meal—a "cena recta". The clients were appalled at such reactionary legislation: they had lost their only means of subsistence: there was so much complaint that the change lasted

only for a short time. We have a pleasant little poem (III.7) from Martial about it, in which he asks his fellow-dependants how they regard the new arrangement :

centum miselli iam valete quadrantes,
anteambulonis congiarum lassi, . . .
quid cogitatis, o fames amicorum ?
regis superbi sportulae recesserunt.

And they answer in one voice :

nihil stropharum est : iam salarium dandum est.

" Goodbye to you now, wretched hundred farthings, distributed as our dole for acting as weary escort. What do you think, my starving friends ? The dole the haughty patron gave us is now abolished. What about it ? "

And their answer comes :

" There can be no dodging it : he must pay us a salary as well as a dinner."

But what of the dinner itself to which the client, no longer a paid attendant, is invited by his patron ? Let Martial tell us in a poem (III. 60) written to his patron :

cum vocer ad cenam non iam venalis ut ante,
cur mihi non eadem, quae tibi, cena datur ?
ostrea tu sumis stagno saturata Lucrino,
sugitur inciso mitulus ore mihi :
sunt tibi boleti, fungos ego sumo suillos :
res tibi cum rhombost, at mihi cum sparulo :
aureus inmodicis turtur te clunibus implet,
ponitur in cavea mortua pica mihi.
cur sine te ceno, cum tecum, Pontice, cenem ?
sportula quod non est, prosit : edamus idem.

" Why, Ponticus, when I, no longer a dole-paid client, am invited by you to dinner,
Why is it not the same dinner served to me as to you ?
You take oysters fattened in the Lucrine Lake :
I suck a mussel, cutting my lips on the shell.
You have mushrooms : I get funguses.
You tackle a turbot, but I a brill.
You gorge yourself on the super-fatted haunches of a golden-brown turtle dove :
Before me is set a magpie that has died in its cage.
Why do I dine at a different table from you though I am dining with you ?
Let me have some benefit from the abolition of the money-dole : let us eat the same food."

And since I am quoting, let me quote the amusing little poem (VII. 39) about a client who became so utterly weary of walking

round with his patron and of having his morning broken up and of meeting with supercilious disdain when he saluted the great men, that he decided to simulate an attack of gout as a good excuse for absenting himself: but he made his malingering so realistic that he actually convinced himself he had a genuine bout:

discursus varios vagumque mane
et fastus et ave potentiorum
cum perferre patique iam negaret,
coepit fingere Caelius podagram.
quam dum volt nimis adprobare veram
et sanas linit obligatque plantas
inceditque gradu laborioso,
(quantum cura potest et ars doloris!)
desit fingere Caelius podagram.

"Wishing to prove that it was absolutely genuine, he plasters and bandages his perfectly healthy feet, and walks with a hobbling gait. Well—such is the powerful effect of scientifically shamming pain—it's no longer a *pretended* gout that Caelius has got."

About all this treatment of clients, Martial, like his contemporary, Juvenal, feels bitterly. The condition of a slave, he tells us, is much preferable to that of a free poor citizen. The slave is not dunned for debts he cannot pay, nor bothered by social duties: he is fed, given shelter, and a place to sleep quietly: and thus he is three times as well off as his master. This need for money and the general lack of money among clients at Rome undoubtedly led to the degrading and shameful practice of cultivating the aged and childless wealthy and so ingratiating oneself by constant attendance and gifts that a fat legacy would be the outcome on the death of the testator. Martial sees all this with his peculiarly sharp vision and he leaves us almost a photographic record of what takes place: he writes (VI. 63) to a rich old man, Marianus:

"You know, Marianus, that you are being fished for, and you know the rapacity of the fisherman who is angling for you, and you know the fisherman's purpose. Yet, you foolish man, in your last will and testament you name him your heir and you mean him to take your place. You say, 'oh! but the gifts he sent me were splendid.' Yes, but he sent them as bait on a hook. Can the fish really love the fisherman? Will this man mourn your death with any genuine grief? If you want him to feel sorrow, Marianus, *leave him nothing.*"

However, it is pleasant to record the experience of one "captator" (X. 97) which turned out unexpectedly: his intended

victim, the aged and stricken invalid, was at his last gasp: his life was despaired of: all the preparations for the funeral are complete, pyre, ointments, grave, bier and funeral-director. It only remains for him to make his will and name the "captator" as his heir. Well, what happened?

dum levis arsura struitur Libitina papyro,
dum murram et casias flebilis uxor emit,
iam scrobe, iam lecto, iam pollinctore parato
heredem scripsit me Numa: convaluit.

"While the lightly built pyre was being laid with papyrus for kindling,
While the weeping wife was buying myrrh and casia,
When the grave and the bier and the undertaker were ready,
Numa inscribed me in his will as heir, and—recovered!"

Martial is bitter enough about the indignities put upon a freeborn client at Rome, but often he is even more indignant at the lack of reward for a man-of-letters in the capital of the world. It is indeed a hard life for a poet. In those days there were no royalties from publishers, no copyright, no literary agents to look after a writer's interests: there is no clear evidence that any author of the first century A.D. got any financial benefit from the publication of his work. The bookseller, of course, charged for the copies of it: but he took the risk and bore the expense of having it transcribed by his copyists. If the author was successful, he acquired reputation: and if he had a wealthy patron, and had flattered him by a dedication or a special mention, he might be given a sum of money or some other material reward; but as often as not, all he got was applause—for Helicon has all the ornamental trappings, but no solid benefit for the poet (I. 76):

praeter aquas Helicon et serta lyrasque dearum
nil habet et magnum, sed perinane, sophos.

"Isn't it strange," Martial says (X. 76), "how Fortune distributes her gifts! Yonder is a Roman citizen, Maevius, not a slave, not an immigrant from Syria, Parthia, or Cappadocia, 'sed de plebe Remi Numaeque verna,' a pleasant and friendly man, honest too and blameless, educated in both Greek and Latin, altogether an admirable person, but having one fault and no small fault—'quod est poeta:' that's why he goes cold in a black cowl, while the mule-driver Incitatus walks in flaming

scarlet." The fact is (and Martial expresses it bitterly in many of his poems) if a man is coming to live in this city of Rome and means to keep himself in any comfort, he need not count on any qualities of character to help him on, nor any qualities of mind. If he wants to have money, he ought to become a popular musician. Indeed Martial for a while left Rome and went to Forum Cornelium in Cisalpine Gaul because he could no longer put up with the useless social duties required of a client; and if Rome wonders where he is and why he went and when he will return, he sends her a message that will explain all (III. 4): the self-exiled poet is undergoing a change: he will return when he has got a profitable profession—

poeta
exierat: veniet cum citharoedus erit.

Therefore if you are educating your son for life in the city, you must watch carefully what you have him taught (V. 56): guard him from the unremunerative literary subjects: the aim of education should be profitableness:

cui tradas, Lupe, filium magistro
quaeris sollicitus diu rogasque.
omnes grammaticosque rhetorasque
devites moneo: nihil sit illi
cum libris Ciceronis aut Maronis,
famae Tutilium suae relinquat;
si versus facit, abdices poetam.
artes discere vult pecuniosas?
fac discat citharoedus aut choraules.
si duri puer ingeni videtur,
praeconem facias vel architectum.

"You have long been anxiously enquiring and asking what kind of master to send your son to, Lupus. Well, I advise you to avoid all teachers of literature and of oratory; keep him clear of the works of Cicero and of Virgil: don't let him emulate Tutilius' fame as a lawyer: and if he writes poetry, disinherit the poet. But suppose he wants to learn the money-making arts? See that he learns to be a harp-player or a flute-player—or if he seems to be dull-witted, make him an auctioneer or an architect."

Martial therefore concludes that, if great works of literature are to be produced, writers must not be expected to depend on a mean pittance but should have a competency, adequate recognition, and complete freedom from anxiety; and it is only the patrons who can confer such a boon (I. 107),

otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim
Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo.

Martial again and again calls for a Maecenas (VIII. 56) who will endow literature and thus make possible a revival of poetry :

sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones.

But the age of wealthy nobles was past. The only patron of letters who could now provide pensions for poets was the Emperor. Caesar must become the universal patron : only the head of the State could adequately reward writers whose work was of service to the State. Teachers and professors had been well provided for. Vespasian had instituted a class of teachers graded and salaried on a systematic and permanent scheme : why could not some comparable benefit be conferred on poets ? The only fault in the age of Domitian, says Martial (V. 19), an age which he claims to have surpassed all earlier ages in most respects, is the fact that the poor man, the penniless writer, is not cared for and there is no one to befriend him in his poverty : the triumphs of Domitian's age, the favours bestowed on it by heaven, the enlargement and adornment of the city—these, says the poet, had never before been equalled :

est tamen hoc vitium, sed non leve, sit licet unum,
quod colit ingratas pauper amicitias.

Therefore to remedy this one fault in an almost perfect age, Caesar must be the patron of poets and writers :

esto tu, Caesar, amicus :
nulla ducis virtus dulcior esse potest.

In fact, Titus and Domitian had each conferred on Martial the " ius trium liberorum " (which brought him whatever privileges the actual father of three children could have) and a tribuneship which carried with it the honorary status of knight. At some time towards the latter part of his career he owned a small estate at Nomentum about twenty miles north-east of Rome, and later he also acquired a town-house in Rome : but his circumstances were never easy : and after the death of Domitian and succession of Nerva, either because he found the new régime less sympathetic or because his finances were still difficult, or because, as he grew older, the chances of ease in Rome seemed less, he

decided to return to Spain, where through the kindness of friends and the liberality of a Spanish patroness, Marcella, he was given a small estate sufficient for his needs. He lived there not unhappily till his death in 104 A.D.

The Roman historians have not much good to say about the Emperor Domitian. The fifteen years of his reign (81-96 A.D.) are described by Tacitus in the *Agricola* as a grim tyranny in which the liberal arts and all freedom and indeed even speech itself were suppressed by this jealous and ruthless Emperor. The impression we get is of a haughty, morose, vain, suspicious man, who at the same time was ambitious, impulsive and dangerous. The portrait given by Suetonius is little better. And the Younger Pliny in his *Panegyricus*, addressed to Trajan, uses every trait of Domitian as a foil to heighten the virtues and glories of the new Emperor whom he is extolling. I feel that the Roman writers were all too prone to emphasize these extremes of contrast: they adored antithesis not only of phrase, but of character: it was part of their rhetorical education. Scipio Africanus and Hannibal are contrasted in Livy, Caesar and Pompey in Lucan, Aeneas and Turnus in Virgil; and so the unpopular Domitian is set over against his brother Titus who was acclaimed as "deliciae populi Romani". Now, contrast is a powerful and useful device, but in Roman hands it tended to make the black blacker so as to intensify the radiance of the white; and I am not sure that a more subtle or controlled gradation of the difference between virtue and vice might not have given Domitian a rather less repellent reputation. Certainly, coming from the pages of Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, and Juvenal, one is surprised to find the transfiguration (I can use no other word) which has befallen Domitian. As Martial sees him, or chooses to portray him, he is a very different figure—angelic, noble, generous, the vice-regent on earth of Jupiter, approachable, willing to be entreated, interested in the arts especially poetry, and exercising a cleansing moral influence in the life of the State. He is a successful general, not the organizer of a sham triumph as he appears in Tacitus: he has won victories over the Germans, the Sarmatians, and the Dacians. Like Augustus, he has given his name to the calendar—to two months, for September in

which he came to the throne he has decided to call "Germanicus", and October in which he was born is to be called "Domitianus". Hence Martial (IX. 1) speaks of the first day of September as "Germanicarum magna lux Kalendarum". The Emperor's Sarmatian campaign was so enthralling (VII. 6 and 7), especially when dispatches of victory began to arrive, that the Romans' minds were far away from Rome—with Caesar in the field, and not a man of them could have told you which of the favourite horses was running in the Circus that day:

> adeoque mentes omnium tenes unus
> ut ipsa magni turba nesciat Circi
> utrumne currat Passerinus an Tigris.

The Emperor in his achievements is like Hercules: he has come through many labours to final acknowledgement of his greatness. This theme is one that appeals both to Emperor and poet. Domitian built a temple to Hercules on the Appian Way and erected beside it a huge golden statue of the god—but with his own head and features imposed on top of it. Martial develops the theme with zest: Jupiter now, he says (IX. 65), will have no hesitation in accepting Hercules as his true son or in acknowledging the sonship and godhead of Alcides,

> postquam pulchra dei Caesaris ora geris;

and if the original Hercules had had these features, Juno's heart would have been won and the twelve labours avoided. The twelve labours were great: but what of the labours that Domitian has accomplished? how do they compare with those of the ancient and lesser Hercules? They are so surpassing that the likeness of Domitian on the statue of Hercules is not enough: let the Emperor give his features to Jupiter Capitolinus (IX. 101):

> templa deis, mores populis dedit, otia ferro,
> astra suis, caelo sidera, serta Iovi.
> Herculeum tantis numen non sufficit actis:
> Tarpeio deus hic commodet ora patri.

"He has given temples to the gods, sound morals to his nation, peace to the sword, deification to his father and brother, stars to the firmament, and wreaths to Jupiter. The divine personality of Hercules is not enough for such achievements: let this god of ours lend his features to the statue of Jupiter."

This ascription of divinity to the Emperor was completely in accord with Domitian's wishes as we learn from Suetonius (*Dom.*

xiii), and it is everywhere present in the poems. In V. 8 he speaks of the "edictum domini deique nostri"; he calls Domitian "dux sanctus, praeses mundi, summe mundi rector et parens orbis". His safety and preservation are the surest proof that the gods exist and are beneficent (II. 91),

rerum certa salus, terrarum gloria, Caesar,
sospite quo magnos credimus esse deos.

Jupiter, in fact, doesn't want to be bothered with human petitions when a power so generous and willing exists on earth (VI. 10): "When I was recently praying to Jupiter for a few thousands, he answered: 'the one on earth who gave me the temples, he will provide for you,'

"ille dabit" dixit "qui mihi templa dedit."

So in future when he supplicates Jupiter, it will be a prayer for the Emperor only: all personal prayers he will address to Domitian (VII. 60), and he begs Jupiter not to misunderstand:

nil pro me mihi, Iuppiter, petenti
ne succensueris velut superbo:
te pro Caesare debeo rogare:
pro me debeo Caesarem rogare.

When, therefore, he ventures to address a prayer to Domitian, he begs fervently that it may be granted (VIII. 24): but if not—giving a clever turn to the poem, he prays that at least the request may be allowed to be made, because it is not the image-maker who creates the gods, but the worshipper and petitioner:

qui fingit sacros auro vel marmore vultus,
non facit ille deos: qui rogat, ille facit.

In fact, if he were invited to dinner by a summons simultaneously from Jupiter and from Domitian, it would be a nice problem of protocol to decide which to accept (IX. 91); but he is sure what his answer would be:

astra licet propius, Palatia longius essent,
responsa ad superos haec referenda darem:
'quaerite qui malit fieri conviva Tonantis:
me meus in terris Iuppiter, ecce, tenet.'

"Though the sky was nearer and the Palace farther away, I would give this answer to be returned to the Gods of Heaven: 'Find someone who would prefer to be the guest of Jupiter: don't you see, I'm engaged with my own Jupiter here on earth.'"

It is with equally avowed admiration, and sometimes also with a little brisk fun, that he greets some of Domitian's legislation in the State. You will recall how Domitian assumed the office of censor early in his reign and, contrary to all precedent, held on to it for the rest of his life. Politically, this gave him control of the Senate and he could advance to that order or degrade from it at his own will and choice. But he also exercised the censorial powers to institute a kind of moral purge of the city by re-instituting certain lapsed laws, notably the Lex Julia against adultery, with the result that there was a considerable rush on the part of offenders to get married. Martial refers to it seriously, but he cannot help joking about it too. For example he addresses Domitian (VI. 4) in tones of magniloquent eulogy :

censor maxime principumque princeps,
cum tot iam tibi debeat triumphos,
tot nascentia templa, tot renata,
tot spectacula, tot deos, tot urbes :
plus debet tibi Roma, quod pudica est.

" Greatest of censors and prince of princes,
Although Rome is indebted to you for so many victories,
For so many new temples being built, and so many old ones reconstructed,
For so many spectacles, so many gods, so many cities,
Yet Rome is still more indebted to you for making her chaste."

But listen to this in a different vein (V. 75) :

quae legis causa nupsit tibi Laelia, Quinte,
uxorem potes hanc dicere legitimam.

" Laelia who married you to comply with the law, Quintus,
you can now surely call your *lawful* spouse."

And this (VI. 7) is a characteristically satirical comment on the law :

Iulia lex populis ex quo, Faustine, renata est
atque intrare domos iussa Pudicitia est,
aut minus aut certe non plus tricesima lux est,
et nubit decimo iam Telesilla viro.

" Faustinus, it is now the thirtieth day, perhaps less, certainly not more, since the Julian law was reinstituted and chastity officially ordered to enter our homes —it is just about the thirtieth day and already Telesilla is marrying her tenth husband."

Domitian also re-enacted the Lex Roscia by which the two highest orders in the state, the senators and the knights, were assigned special places in the theatre—the senators having the

orchestra seats in a semicircle in front of the stage, and the knights having the next fourteen rows. Martial as a military tribune had the standing of a knight, and was very proud of his privilege at the theatre. Book V is full of references to comical scenes in the theatres when well-dressed and wealthy upstarts tried to occupy a knight's seat and argue it out with the vigilant attendants. There is for example V. 35, which describes a scene in the theatre when Leïtus the attendant attempts to expel from the knights' stalls an indignant scarlet-clad Greek who wishes to be taken for a rich freedman of equestrian rank, and who protests that he has the full legal income for a knight, since he draws 200,000 sesterces a year from his farm at Patrae and as much again from his property near Corinth ; and as for family, he has an attested pedigree running back to Leda and the swan. As the altercation proceeded, there dropped out of the magnificent pretender's clothes a large key, a door-keeper's key, which revealed him for what he was, a slave :

> dum suscitanti Leïto reluctatur :
> equiti superbo, nobili, locupleti
> cecidit repente magna de sinu clavis.
> nunquam, Fabulle, nequior fuit clavis.

" While he was struggling against Leïtus, who was removing him, out of the robe of this proud, aristocratic, wealthy knight there suddenly tumbled a large door-key. Never, Fabulus, was there a more perverse key."

How far can these complimentary poems about Domitian be trusted ? How true is the evidence they afford ? It may be said in their favour that Book V, being specially intended for Domitian's reading, has been made to conform to the new standard of at least legal morality which the Emperor has instituted, and the tone of the book has been very much improved, so that the Emperor may read it with face unashamed in the very presence of his patron goddess Pallas Athene (V. 2) ; but readers who enjoy " nequitiae procaciores salesque nudi" are referred back to the first four books already published. Similarly in Book VIII, which is specifically dedicated to the Emperor, he states that his epigrams have not been allowed to speak with as much playful licence as before (VIII. *proem.*) though, of course, he does allow a certain admixture of jest. " As the greater part, and

better part, of my book is attached to the Majesty of your sacred name, it should remember that only those cleansed by religious purification ought to approach the temple " ; and therefore in the first poem he dismisses Venus and welcomes Pallas the patroness of Caesar :

> nuda recede Venus ; non est tuus iste libellus :
> tu mihi, tu Pallas Caesariana, veni.

And it must be said that the tone of these two books is such that they could indeed be read, as Martial claims, by " matronae, puerique, virginesque ".

On the other hand, it is notable that Book X, which had passed into circulation just before Domitian's death, was in fact withdrawn, remodelled, and republished two years later ; and the only conclusion one can draw is that the first draft contained poems in praise of Domitian which would have been unacceptable to the new régime, however liberal that régime was. This is supported by the fact that in the new edition there is a kind of apology or palinode (X. 72), in which the poet dismisses *Blanditiae* from his books so as to make room for sincere and truthful praise of the new Emperor Trajan,

> frustra, Blanditiae, venitis ad me,
> adtritis miserabiles labellis . . .

" In vain, Flatteries, do you come to me, wretched creatures with your hackneyed lips. I am not now intending to address anyone as Master and God : no longer in this city is there any place for you . . . there is no *Master* here now, but a commander, but a senator the most just of them all, by whose action plain unadorned Truth has been brought back from her exile in the underworld : if you are wise, Rome, under such an Emperor you will beware of speaking in your former tones."

This change of note, this renunciation of flattery, seems to me to cast considerable doubt on the genuineness of his praise of Domitian : he had very quickly adjusted himself to the character of the new ruler.

Martial has written twelve books of epigrams with nearly a hundred poems in each and a total of between 700 and 750 verses in each book. (I omit from consideration the introductory book called the *Liber Spectaculorum*, because it is not really of great poetic interest : and I equally omit Books XIII and XIV which consist of couplet-mottoes meant for inscription on gifts and

presents.) So the whole collection of epigrams amounts to between 8,000 and 9,000 verses—about the same length as the *Aeneid*, except that most of Martial's lines are shorter than hexameters. The poems are short, crisp and pointed. There is nothing aimless or loose in them. The poet knows what he wants to say and the effect he wishes to produce, and he does it with the utmost economy of words and terseness of diction. I have heard his poems described as mechanical, as if he turned them out by automation. I don't agree. The simplicity and precision and rapidity of his execution are such that the technical excellence of his artistry can be missed. What strikes me most is the inevitability of his phrasing : it could not be bettered : it has no surplusage, no fat tissue : it is lean, athletic and swift : he puts it well himself (II. 77) in reply to one of his critics :

non sunt longa quibus nihil est quod demere possis,

" a poem is just right in length if there is nothing that can be omitted without spoiling it " : such a poem has become a natural entity : it is self-sufficient, existing in its own right.

Martial is not a poet of war. In his books no trumpets blare, and no legions march. Nor is he a learned poet. In him there is very little mythology, no recondite allusions, no abstruse echoes of older poets, no laboured effects, no enigma variations. The tone is conversational, direct, plain, neat and crisp, free from that curse of Roman poetry—rhetorical ornament and rhetorical emphasis. He makes no great claims for his verse : he calls it (X. 19),

nec doctum satis et parum severum
sed non rusticulum nimis libellum.

But this absence of academic learning, this unpuritan gaiety, and this air of unaffected urbanity—all these constitute its charm. And when you cast your mind over Latin poetry, this kind of writing is something unique.

His subject-matter was the Rome of his day and the multifarious people whom he saw or met in the houses, the forum, the baths, the Campus, the theatres and streets. He was a poet of life : his books are, in his own phrase, " Roman books dipped in sprightly wit " in which " Life can read and recognize her own

manners " (VIII. 3). His little poems are like snaps, sharp and vivid, of real scenes. He had a great contempt for the poets who produced long epics and dramas on such traditional literary subjects as Oedipus and Thyestes, Colchian witches, Scyllas, and monsters (X. 4) :

hic non Centauros, non Gorgonas, Harpyiasque
invenies : hominem pagina nostra sapit.

" Here in my poems you won't find Centaurs, Gorgons, and Harpies : it is of living humanity that my page smacks." And he has equal scorn for those other escapists from life, the archaizing poets (XI.90), who adore the rough measures and expressions of Accius and Pacuvius, and who love such a hexameter ending as " terrai frugiferai ", and who praise as better than Homer such a vile pentameter as " Lucili columella hic situ' Metrophanes ".

The tone of his epigrams is generally satirical and mocking, but never sour like Juvenal's. As Pliny said of him, " plurimum in scribendo et salis (habebat) et fellis nec candoris minus " : " a lot of wit, a lot of gall, but no less good nature." He had no wish to win notoriety by attacking persons openly by name and damaging their reputation : " ludimus innocui ", he says (VII. 12). He enjoyed the human scene : and laughter, dry and astringent, is the dominant note in his verse. He has no use for an epigrammatist whose poems are merely sweet (VII. 25):

nullaque mica salis, nec amari fellis in illis
gutta est ; o demens, vis tamen illa legi ?

" Not a single grain of wit, not a single drop of gall—and yet do you expect your poems to be read ? "

Martial, on the contrary, requires that his own poems shall have a sharp tang—and he is generally successful. These short disciplined epigrams are made to sting and bite. For example, he attacks a critic who thinks that, because Martial wrote small poems, he had therefore only a small talent. This critic Gaurus had composed a grand epic in twelve books on the wars of Priam. Does this vast work therefore prove him to be a great man ? " Not at all ", says Martial : " I make my small works live : you, Caurus, make a giant of a poem, but an inert clay giant " (IX. 50),

tu magnus luteum, Gaure, Giganta facis.

There are obscenities in Martial's poems. It would be a mistake not to mention this feature which he himself so often mentions and excuses and defends. The licentiousness is sometimes so gross that the Loeb translation renders it into the language of the Decameron. He was criticized in his own day for the *luxuria* of his pages (III. 69): one critic complained (I. 35) that he wrote (and this is putting it mildly)

> versus . . . parum severos
> nec quos praelegat in schola magister.

In his introduction to the First Book he speaks of the naughty realism of the language, " lascivam verborum veritatem ", which he claims to be the proper kind of language for epigrams, because the fashion was set by Catullus who to him is the " magister ". I imagine that in some ways Roman society in its talk must have been a great deal coarser than our own (there is evidence of this in many anecdotes in Suetonius), and Martial naturally mirrors this society. He argues that the type of epigram which he terms Catullan cannot give entire pleasure without an element of bawdiness: this is not introduced because the poet or his readers are depraved: it is not evidence that their character and morals are corrupt: it belongs to the accepted convention of the literary genre (I. 35),

> lex haec carminibus data est iocosis,
> ne possint, nisi pruriant, iuvare.

" This is the law appointed for amusing poems; they can't please unless bawdy."

And for this reason he refuses to have his poems emasculated or expurgated. He does not attack known or recognizable persons: he uses fictitious names: it is always his intention (X. 33)

> parcere personis, dicere de vitiis.

I would not say that Martial reveals any serious or idealistic philosophy of life. He had no religious belief, no faith, as far as I can discover. He makes no profession of philosophic belief: there is nothing in his poems that indicates his adhesion to any particular school of thought. On the whole, I would call him a realist, a man with no illusions about life, with no great ambitions; he desires only such common pleasures as bring comfort without

pain or regret—a mildly optimistic hedonist who knows what he would enjoy but not always how to get it. He has left us his view of what constitutes for him the best in life in a number of poems scattered through the collection, and some of these are in my judgment among the very best that he wrote. His claims on life are not high : the same sentiments have been expressed by other Latin poets perhaps more eloquently : but I find in Martial a simple directness of statement which is in keeping with the plainness of his hopes. You will, perhaps, remember the well-known poem (II. 90) addressed to his countryman Quintilian, the great teacher and professor of rhetoric. It sounds as if Quintilian had been rebuking him for his unwillingness to settle down to a serious profession such as the law, or teaching, which would bring him a settled income. But this is not what Martial wants : he admits he is poor and not too old to begin a profession, but he doesn't want to be tied, he wants to live,

vivere quod propero pauper nec inutilis annis,
da veniam : properat vivere nemo satis.

" Forgive me, Quintilian, for being in a hurry *to live, to enjoy life* . . . ; no man ever makes enough speed in enjoying life."

His wants are few. He has no desire for power or wealth. His tastes are simple and not beyond attainment : he sets them out for Quintilian very simply : here they are :

me focus et nigros non indignantia fumos
tecta iuvant et fons vivus et herba rudis.
sit mihi verna satur, sit non doctissima coniunx,
sit nox cum somno, sit sine lite dies.

" What gives me pleasure is a fire on the hearth, and rafters with the black smoke eddying through them, and a well of spring water, and a plot of untrimmed grass. I would like to have a well-fed slave, and a wife educated but not a bluestocking, a sound night's sleep, and a day without a lawsuit."

That theme, which insists on the urgent immediacy of living *now*, recurs through all Latin poetry ; but again and again in these poems it comes with a delightful freshness and charm. Pleasures are fugitive : we must clutch them with both hands (I. 15),

non est, crede mihi, sapientis dicere " vivam " :
sera nimis vita est crastina : vive hodie.

" Believe me, it's not the part of a wise man to say ' I intend to live ' : living tomorrow is too late : live today, my friend."

In fact, neither living tomorrow nor living today is good enough : the only wise man is he who has already lived yesterday (V. 58) :

cras te victurum, cras dicis, Postume, semper.
dic mihi, cras istud, Postume, quando venit ?
quam longe cras istud, ubi est ? aut unde petendum ?
numquid apud Parthos Armeniosque latet ? . . .
cras vives ? hodie iam vivere, Postume, serum est :
ille sapit quisquis, Postume, vixit heri.

" Tomorrow you say you will live, Postumus, always tomorrow.
That tomorrow of yours, when does it arrive ? Tell me.
How distant is it ? Where is it ? Where is it to be found ?
Is it hidden somewhere in Parthia or Armenia ? . . .
Tomorrow will you live ? To live to-day it's too late even now.
He's the wise man who really lived yesterday."

And what is this living, this enjoyment of life, this realization of a swiftly passing existence, that Martial speaks about so feelingly ? He tells us in two poems which I consider to be among the very best he wrote. They are both addressed to Julius Martialis, his closest friend at Rome for thirty-three years. The first is V. 20 : in it he gives utterance to the deep hatred he has come to feel for the conventional life of the retainer whose time belongs not to himself but is given to his patron. He wishes to be free to enjoy the social company and talk and freedom of the Roman capital :

" If you and I, my dear Martial, had the chance to enjoy together unworried days, and to have our time unoccupied by business and our own to dispose of, and both alike to have leisure for genuine life, we shouldn't have anything to do with the halls or mansions of the great or grim lawsuits or the gloomy forum or lordly families : but the promenade, the conversation, the notices, the Campus Martius, the colonnade, the coolness of the shade, the baths—these would always be our haunts and this our work. But as it is, neither of us sets the plan for his own life. We see the good sunny days slipping away and passing beyond recall, days that are lost to us and yet are included in our reckoning. Does any man, if he knows how to live, put off beginning ?"'

bonosque
soles effugere atque abire sentit,
qui nobis pereunt et inputantur.
quisquam, vivere cum sciat, moratur ?

And the second poem (X. 47) simply states the things which in the poet's opinion make for a happier life—and they are not all to be found in a Welfare State :

vitam quae faciant beatiorem,
iucundissime Martialis, haec sunt :
res non parta labore, sed relicta ;
non ingratus ager, focus perennis ;
lis numquam, toga rara, mens quieta ;
vires ingenuae, salubre corpus ;
prudens simplicitas, pares amici ;
convictus facilis, sine arte mensa ;
nox non ebria, sed soluta curis ;
non tristis torus, et tamen pudicus ;
somnus, qui faciat breves tenebras :
quod sis, esse velis, nihilque malis ;
summum nec metuas diem nec optes.

" What makes life happier, my genial friend Martial, are things like these :
Means not gained by work but inherited by bequest ;
A pleasantly rewarding demesne, a fire on the hearth perpetually alight ;
No lawsuits, the formal toga seldom worn, a mind at peace ;
A free man's natural vigour, a healthy body ;
Candor with discretion : congenial friends ;
Good-natured companionableness : a menu not elaborated.
An evening not intoxicated but relaxed and carefree ;
A wife who is jolly and yet chaste ;
Sleep so sound that it's morning before you know ;
To be content with what you are and not wish to be something else :
Neither to dread your final day nor to wish for it."

RUSKIN'S FRIENDSHIP WITH MRS. FANNY TALBOT [1]

By MARGARET E. SPENCE, M.A., PH.D.
LECTURER IN EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

She's a motherly, bright, black-eyed woman of fifty with a nice married son who is a superb chessplayer. She herself is a very good one, and it's her greatest indulgence to have a written game with me. She's an excellent nurse, and curious beyond any magpie that ever was, but always giving her spoons away instead of stealing them. Practically clever beyond most women ; but if you answer one question she'll ask you six ! [2]

SO wrote John Ruskin about his generous friend and devoted admirer, Mrs. Fanny Talbot, to the Rev. J. P. Faunthorpe, Principal of Whitelands College for Schoolmistresses ; and this description sets a seal on the kind of friendship that existed between them. To Ruskin she represented the mother, the person to whom unfailing appeals could be made for sympathy, help and affection. More than that, he saw her as she was : a middle-aged mother with a married son. That conception of her enabled him to write freely to her without any fear that she, like so many of his younger women correspondents, would fall in love with him and become thereby an emotional liability. She was to him—as he wrote—*Mama* Talbot—good, kind and comforting. It is not so easy to define Mrs. Talbot's attitude towards Ruskin ; certainly she saw him as someone infinitely precious who needed care and cherishing, but it would be unwise to assume that her attitude was wholly maternal. At one stage in their correspondence Ruskin had occasion to explain gently to her that she could not help him with affection, that no one since Rose la Touche was dead could do that, but that he was grateful for her kindness and true friendship. Even in his later Brantwood days, he was a

[1] Grateful acknowledgement is made to the Ruskin Trustees and to their publisher, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., for permission to include extracts from various unpublished letters quoted in this article.

[2] *Letters from John Ruskin to Rev. J. P. Faunthorpe, M.A.*, edited by Thomas J. Wise, Vol. II, lxxiv (London: Privately Printed, 1895).

little shocked by her suggestion that he should call her Fanny, and although—probably to spare her feelings—he did on two or three occasions address her as she wished, he quickly dropped into the old way of writing "Dear Mama Talbot" or "My dearest Mrs. Talbot". So long as he could use such friendly salutations in his letters to her, he was happy and drew comfort from their relationship for he felt that he could remain with impunity her "poorly little John Ruskin" with full rights to be mothered by her letters.

It was the Guild of St. George which brought about their friendship, for Mrs. Talbot, like Blanche Atkinson, was an avid reader of *Fors Clavigera*. True, she had made slight acquaintance with Ruskin when her son, Quarry, had consulted him about his artistic powers; probably she learned much about him from his chess-playing friend, Alexander Macdonald, but the monthly *Fors* letters gave her, as they gave so many others, a new feeling of friendship with him. Unlike Blanche Atkinson, Mrs. Talbot did not seek him out by letter, instead she asked Macdonald to tell Ruskin of her wish to make a gift to his Guild of St. George of land and cottages in Barmouth. It may be that she was goaded by Ruskin's taunt in the September *Fors*:

> Not one of you, maid or mother, though I have besought you these four years (except only one or two of my personal friends) has joined St. George's Company.[1]

Certainly her generous offer astonished Ruskin, whose emotions on learning of the gift ranged from incredulity to delight, and so the friendship was established on a note of great cordiality. At once this gift of land raised her to the level of patron, a position she shared with some degree of jealousy with George Baker, a wealthy Birmingham manufacturer; it also secured for her a life interest in Ruskin for she had thereby, as administrator of this property, the right to consult him on all matters pertaining to the Barmouth land. It is evident from the correspondence that Ruskin—especially when she caught him in moments of melancholy weakness after grave illness at Brantwood, or hard at work in Venice or at Oxford—always hoped that one day she would learn that he expected her to exercise her own judgement and authority in all matters related to the Guild's Barmouth property.

[1] *Fors Clavigera*, 4, XLV, 165 (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.).

Mrs. Talbot, however, was long in learning that lesson ; indeed, she never learned it so long as he was strong in mind and body.

Naturally she constantly begged him to visit her and inspect the land, and Ruskin planned such a visit in the summer of 1875 on his way from Coniston to Oxford, but difficulties arose and she had to wait a whole year before the visit could take place. Meantime the friendship grew firmer through their frequent letters. Like a good friend, Mrs. Talbot concerned herself with his health and her concern grew the greater when she sensed Ruskin's increasing interest in spiritualism, which she attributed largely to Mrs. Cowper-Temple's influence. In some ways Mrs. Cowper-Temple and Mrs. Talbot played a similar role in his life ; he called them " Mama " in his letters, he liked to feel that they were anxious about his health, but of course Mrs. Cowper-Temple was the older friend. She was the beautiful unknown lady he noted with such enthusiasm on a youthful visit to Italy, and then she became a strong ally in his dismal attempt to secure the love of Rose la Touche. There is greater warmth in his letters to Mrs. Cowper-Temple, to whom he liked to remain " Ever your poor loving little boy ". Possibly the statement made by Ruskin in a letter to her, written in August 1875, gives best indication of his need :

> It is so precious to me, to be thought of as a child and needing to be taken care of, in the midst of the weary sense of teaching and having all things and creatures depending on me—and one's self, a nail stuck in an insecure place.[1]

Of the two women there can be little doubt that Mrs. Fanny Talbot, with her stock of commonsense as well as her warmly sympathetic nature, could offer him the more secure place. Mrs. Cowper-Temple was emotional and excitable ; the story told of her by Arthur Severn in his unpublished autobiographical fragment illustrates perhaps her enthusiasm as distinct from her sense. From Severn's account it would appear that she arrived in Matlock in 1871 somewhat dramatically on learning of Ruskin's dangerous illness, and when admitted finally to his bedroom was instructed by him to buy a note-book in which to set down his thoughts. The excited lady immediately searched the shops and returned bearing a costly morocco leather gilt-edged note-book.

[1] *Works*, Library Edition, XXIV, xxi.

After lunch she climbed the stairs to his room in a dedicated manner ready to write down his every thought. A short time later she emerged trembling, and gazing up at Arthur Severn she told him in horrified astonishment that the only thing Ruskin had required her to set down in her expensive note-book was "Hellish abomination! Coleman's Mustard."

It was probably Mrs. Cowper-Temple's kindness of heart that caused her, when she witnessed Ruskin's grief at the death of Rose, to interest him in the work of Home and other spiritualists and to encourage him to look for consolation in séances held at Broadlands, her home. Mrs. Talbot foresaw disaster in such indulgences, and after lunching with him at Oxford on Wednesday, 25 November 1875, expressed herself forcibly in a letter to which he replied at some length :

I cannot enough thank you for your letter—both for its confidence, and its regard for me ;—nor less for its most helpful warning. I hear facts about spiritualism, and have seen some which gave me—and still give—the deepest anxiety to know more of the new dispensation under which we live—but the sorrow which has made that change upon me you saw,—is the very strongest guard I have against the danger. For I know that—if she *can* come to me, she will, without my dishonouring the love I bear her by impatience or mean methods of appeal ; and if any *good* angel is to be sent to me,—*she* will be sent. And meantime, I am clear that it is no part of my duty, perhaps not even permitted to me to follow out this frightful mystery that is tormenting or disturbing so many.—I *know* that so far as I myself see, I see rightly ; that what I recognise for noble and ignoble—for joy or sorrow,—is so, and may be shown to be so, to the good of all men.—I seek no more than *all* may find.—If God chooses to tell me, by dream—vision—or miracle—more than I yet know—He will do it at His own time and as He sees best—and according to the degree in which I now obey what light He has given me. I may be worn out—or broken—or blunted—or spoiled by earthly weakness and failure in watching—or—in temper of Prayer.—But I shall not—(I speak reverently)—be misled or maddened, or betrayed by false fire.[1]

The following month Mrs. Cowper-Temple invited Ruskin to spend a few weeks at Broadlands and while he was there she arranged for a series of séances to take place. On Tuesday, 14 December, he noted in his Diary that he had attended a séance held the previous evening in the drawing-room where he and Rose had once known great happiness, and confessed that he was overwhelmed by the evidence of the other state of the world provided by a medium named Mrs. Ackworth. It became a

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/10 (29.11.75).

general custom in the evening at Broadlands for Ruskin to consult a second medium, by name Miss Wagstaff, after she had been put in a trance by Mrs. Cowper-Temple. Bewildered by these experiences and burdened with a cold, he grew anxious about his health and his confused mental state but, as the séances continued and his cold improved, he gradually became convinced that he was a witness to the truth, previously hidden from him by his own blindness. George Macdonald joined the party at Broadlands on 21 December, and he made this comment in a letter :

There's a Mrs. A. here. I don't take to her much, but R. is interested. She has seen and described without ever having seen her Rose whispering to Ruskin. He is convinced.[1]

From this moment Rose took on a saintly aspect in Ruskin's mind and in its weakened, wilder state he came in time of illness to identify her with St. Ursula. He wrote at the beginning of 1876 to his friend, Charles Norton, to tell him of his experience at Broadlands, but he gave a fuller account to Mrs. Talbot in the hope that she would rejoice with him in his new-found happiness :

I owe it to your regard and affection to tell you this much—that only a little while after I answered you—" If any message is to be brought to me, *one* spirit will come bearing it "—that *one* came—in the house of the lady named in the preface to Sesame and Lilies—φιλη—(beside whom the shade I looked for was first seen) —who had been the chief friend to both of us to whom we went in all saddest times.

Well—since that day, all things have more or less worked together for good for me—and chiefly and markedly today—I cannot write more of myself—but the solemnity and sweetness of your letter—and its speaking of your separation for a time from your children, could not but open my lips—and heart.[2]

Mrs. Talbot hastily re-emphasized the dangers into which he was running and he replied :

Your warning is of profound interest to me, in its further proof of some great reality in all the evil of these things. Do not be in fear for me. I have passed through too much to be in danger now. I believe the worst the evil spirits could do against her and me was done while she lived.

But if they come between us again, they will get no more victory than hitherto. *My* danger lies in unbelief of—not in seeking—the other world.[3]

Mrs. Talbot's hope that he would visit her in Barmouth was fulfilled in the summer of 1876. She wrote in June reminding

[1] *George MacDonald and his Wife*, Greville MacDonald (Allen and Unwin 1924).

[2] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/11 (13.2.76). [3] Ibid. 1161/12 (21.2.76).

him of his promise and describing the glories of Barmouth in June moonlight, but Ruskin explained that his work on the mineral catalogue for the Walkley Museum was likely to delay him for some time. He arrived at Dolgelly on 1 August, spent the night at a dismal inn, and informed Mrs. Talbot of his intention to travel to Barmouth the following day. It would appear from *Fors* that his train journey from Ulverston to Dolgelly was not only wearisome but tedious and unhygienic. Worst of all, at Ruabon he was required to share a carriage with two " cadaverous sexagenarian spinsters " who, according to Ruskin, preferred " breathing the richest compound of products of their own indigestion " [1] to opening a carriage window. He arrived in Barmouth on Thursday, 3 August, when the weather was at its loveliest despite a stormy summer. Among the Rylands Ruskin manuscripts is a rough pencilled account of this visit which Mrs. Talbot prepared for her friend and fellow Companion of the Guild, Canon Rawnsley. She made this comment on his arrival :

It was in August '76, July it was to have been but was put off again and again—at last the day seemed particularly fixed then letter from Dolgelly : he had been quite obliged to stop there to revive old recollections of 40 years ago—and to write something of his journey for Fors whilst it was fresh in his mind—but he could be down by train next day. Suddenly in the afternoon some luggage appeared marked J.R. and his man saying they had driven from Dolgelly—but about 3 miles back he had got out of the carriage saying it was too beautiful, he must walk—and we must not wait dinner, he could not eat any—he would like tea better—and so at last he did arrive—and we could scarcely believe that we really had him in our possession—before he left us for the night at 10 o'clock.[2]

Unhappily Ruskin felt wretchedly sick and ill that night, but he soon recovered and was able to walk on the sea-shore, climb hills and drive in the country. It was not until Sunday that he visited the Guild property which must have utterly dismayed him, for he described it in his Diary as a dismal sight for heart and eyes. Mrs. Talbot's account of this visit explains his depression :

We went with him to all the Cottages—and introduced him to the tenants, at one of the very poorest a dark little place we found the father and mother both out at

[1] *Fors* 6, LXIX, 284.
[2] Rylands Eng. MS. 1164/21.

work—and a little heap of dirty children on the floor—the eldest a girl about 9—in charge of the younger ones—it greatly distressed him and he said we must find someone to take care of these children whilst their parents were at work—but of course that was impossible.[1]

A few days after his arrival his manservant, Downes, caught a chill and developed inflammation of the lungs. Mrs. Talbot made this comment on the crisis :

We thought he [Ruskin] would send him back—and telegraph for another to come—but came to us soon after saying he could not bear to send poor Downes away as it was the first time he had ever been with him—and it would so mortify him—our girls could do everything he wanted—and he could go on with his work as well here as at home if we could let him stay rather longer than he had intended—so it was arranged and he was with us for 10 days—instead of 4 or 5, poor Downes with nursing and poulticing was soon about again—and we were very thankful to him for getting ill.[2]

Downes's illness really disturbed Ruskin, and despite Mrs. Talbot's desire to please, he noted in his Diary that things were on the whole difficult and uncomfortable although, curiously, he made no mention of the Talbot household. In his depression his doubts centred on his Guild of St. George and on one occasion, while walking disconsolately on the hills after eating plum pudding at lunchtime, he contemplated abandoning the project. He was thankful when Downes was strong enough to travel to Oxford with him, and he sent this gay note to Mrs. Talbot :

I came away in acute anxiety lest you might not have seen my grey hat wave in reply to your handkerchiefs.—This sorrowful doubt partly embittered the lovely drive to Dolgelly—together with the telegraph wires which [and he drew the scene] are arranged so as to drop on the landscape every three seconds in this manner.[3]

Mrs. Talbot noted a difference in Ruskin's mood soon after his return from Barmouth and she received from Venice this reply to her anxious query :

Yes, I am very sad ; but not more than when I was with you—and I do no more than I am able for. Of course when I am with nice people I take all the joy I can and don't tell them what is beneath—or what is *not* beneath—for the sorrow tells more in making me hard and cold, than miserable.[4]

Sensing his innermost despair while at work in Venice she sent an affectionate letter which he greatly appreciated, but for a time he

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1164/21.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. 1161/33 (n.d.).
[4] Ibid. 1161/36 (2.9.76).

could not reply because he felt unable to explain to one as warm and kindly as herself the real significance of a broken heart. This was the explanation he eventually gave :

All *natural* griefs, however great, fill, but don't break hearts ; whatever *you* feel of sorrow, only makes you kinder *more*—capable of affection rather than less.

But a quite horrible, unnatural sorrow that is to say not of the kind which human nature is meant to bear, like this on the death of my mistress in madness, does, where the heart has been wholly given, break it wholly ; so that there is no true life in it any more. I have plenty of sympathy & compassion left—but no love. I was very happy the other day, to be able to give a poor—(and quite ugly!) girl thirty francs, her family's savings for a month, which she had lost on the way to put into the bank—and was in an agony of distress such as one rarely sees—and I am very sorry for my gondolier who is ill, and I am profoundly grateful to *you* for your goodness to Downes.--But you can't help me with affection.—If the dead live, some day, also, I shall live again—but I am as dead as they, now.[1]

Mrs. Talbot's sympathetic answer to this letter won further confidences from him :

I am indeed grateful for this loving & lovely letter, and will take the regard you have given me trustfully,—and lean on it, to do which is when I look into my mind, the worst of the difficulties is that hardness in me.—I never can believe that people really care for me, I fancy they don't know themselves and will change,—and that no love but one's mother's, or true mistress's—is to be trusted. This feeling has been chiefly fixed in me by the failure of Rosie's mother to me ; she *was* my very dearest friend, while Rosie was young—and I loved her deeply—and went to her always for advice, and help—and amusement—and comfort—and when Rosie grew to be eighteen instead of eleven, and was brought to London to be " brought out "—I drew back out of the way quite properly and never thought of or hoped anything—But the child didn't like it, and questioned my cousin about me, and then came forward herself—and asked me " if I would stay just as we used to be for three years, and then ask her ; being ready *then* to receive " yes " or " no ? "

It may be a grave question whether I ought not at once to have refused and told her it was right that we should think no more of each other —with such hardness as might have made her think she could do as her parents wished without giving me much pain.

Were the time to return—I should do again just what I did—say that I was her servant in all things always. Then she was very happy—and that went on for a while ; but I insisted that she should tell her Father—She knew that to do so would be to separate us at once—and hesitating—showed my letter to some " friend "—who told the Father—thus everything inducing him—himself a man of the strictest honour, though hard & selfish—to think *me* treacherous, and his daughter disobedient. His morals—and much more his pride—were alike offended—and to my utter horror—the mother failed me also—They stopped all intercourse between us at once—Rosie did not care but—said " Wait—and it will be all right."

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/37 (27.11.76).

That went on for a year and a half.—Then, when the father and mother found they made no progress, and that Rosie was just as steady to me as the first day, the mother got quite furious with rage—went to Perth, where the people connected with my former wife lived—got whatever they chose to say of me under their hand,—and brought all this to Rosie. The child had never been brought into any contact with evil or evil thoughts before :—she loved and trusted her mother —distrusted herself—and therefore at last, me—She gave me up— ; but, (not the *sorrow*, but) the *horror* of it—effectually broke down her life. For a year she remained silent to me—then gradually by Mrs. Cowper Temple's steady friendship and effort (the φιλη of Sesame and Lilies)—she was restored to me ;—but not the same,—partly ashamed of *herself*—partly in agony of conscience at what was now direct and resolute disobedience to her parents in holding any communication with me—and partly in fits of unconquerable doubt of *me* ;—Her brain gradually gave way—and one of the last scenes between us was long and vain pleading on my part that she would not send a letter to her Father full of *frantic* reproach. We had—altogether—about three happy days together, before she died—but I had one entirely happy week at Chamouni, when she was writing me joyful letters as I was coming home to her in 1874 ; and stopped to see my old Chamouni guide and the places where I used to be with my Father & mother.

I have never heard of or read a story of so bitter tragedy ;—the bride of Lammermoor is like it, but Rosie was a much more perfect and holy creature than Lucy Ashton.

So you see, I have not much of my old self left—but what I am, is faithfully & gratefully yours.[1]

Mrs. Talbot now realized that his need, like the Ancient Mariner's, was to rest his burden on another for a short time, and she was eager to help him in any way. Her immediate action was to present a gift of valuable minerals to his Walkley Museum. He was delighted and sent a happy note of thanks from Venice. Next she sent a cleverly chosen paper-cutter with an agate-crested handle that fascinated him ; he assured her that study of the handle alone would provide him with inspiration enough to complete *Deucalion*. Such gay assurances did not satisfy Mrs. Talbot who was so uneasy in her mind about him that, in the spring of 1877, she made her son, Quarry, write from Italy, ostensibly to seek advice on perspective, but also to suggest a meeting in May. Ruskin brushed aside Quarry's suggestion that he was depressed and emphasized in clear, cold language his need for peace in order to complete the work that so oppressed him :

I shall be here, God willing in May ; (till the 10th perhaps later) but you need not be glad of that—for in Venice I stay only for the hardest work—if I had an hour to spare I should be off instantly—the place is a mere horror to me—dreadful

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161,38 (15.12.76).

as the ruins of ones dearest home—I am not speakable to in it—or when I do speak—it is merely to make everybody miserable—if I can—and to growl at them if I can't—oh me, what a brute you will think me,—indeed I *am* one in Italy.[1]

An intermediary " delicious " letter from Mrs. Talbot mollified him and two weeks later Quarry learned of his change of heart :

It *will* be good for me to see you all here, you affectionate things,—come as soon as you can and stay as long ; but there's no spring here, yet ; and I fear it will be bleak & keen for a fortnight still at least.[2]

There can be little doubt that Ruskin was at first relieved to see Mrs. Talbot ; he enjoyed (when work permitted) his frequent games of chess in the evenings at her hotel. Sometimes they would breakfast together, but of course everything depended on the progress he made with his work. She received on Friday, 11 May, this charming invitation :

May I send my boat for you at ½ past 10 and would you float as far as the other end of the Grand Canal, with me,—for my work is thereaway, today—and I will send my boat back with you to St. James of the Rialto, where your own can be waiting. I've no other chance of ten quiet minutes.[3]

It would appear from his Diary that the day passed dismally for him ; he had a cold, felt bilious and his work left him with a feeling of infinite depression. Frequently he would cancel engagements he had made with her for fear of overtaxing his brain, but when the cold took stronger grip of him, he at once wrote anxiously for advice on the most effective treatment. The cold persisted, and apparently the sympathetic presence of Mrs. Talbot did not always bring comfort for he noted in his Diary that his feeling of loneliness was merely heightened by the kindness of others ; he also noted—although he made no mention of her—that he was being driven mad by perpetual interruptions to his work. Ruskin sensed a growing weakness in himself which alarmed him. Even when his work in Venice was successfully completed and he was safe home at Brantwood his feeling of physical weakness remained. In July he wrote frankly and somewhat wearily to Mrs. Talbot to explain his silence and to make known to her the strain under which he was working, and his belief that he was on the verge of a nervous breakdown.

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1163/2 (5.3.77).
[2] Ibid. 1163/3 (26.3.77).
[3] Ibid. 1161/48 (n.d.).

Nevertheless he continued to send short notes in answer to her Barmouth news. During the early months of 1878 she sent generous donations to the Guild, as well as some sea-weeds of interest and some stuffed birds for him to paint while the cold weather kept him indoors. The month of March realized his fears and brought the terrible illness that aroused world-wide sympathy and interest.

During his illness full responsibility for his care lay with Joan Severn who found great comfort and consolation in the practical help given by Ruskin's distinguished medical friend, John Simon. He stayed at Brantwood during the early days of this illness, and on his departure Joan sent a daily report of Ruskin's condition, mood and even at times, a full account of his ravings, and when his condition worsened she appealed to Dr. Simon who quickly returned to advise Dr. Parsons, Ruskin's local doctor. Joan's letters to the Simons reveal the warmth of feeling that existed between the two families. The Simons were aware of her domestic difficulties; letters that passed between them show that the matter of Ruskin's will and his financial obligation to Joan were freely discussed. It is curious that at a time when Ruskin was too ill to be troubled about money matters she turned to Mrs. Talbot and borrowed a sum from her and not from the Simons. Letters offering help from many counties and countries were delivered at Brantwood. Like Gladstone and many others, Mrs. Cowper-Temple arranged for special prayers for his recovery to be offered in churches; she also made the somewhat unwise suggestion that the presence of a medium at his bedside might bring him relief. Mrs. Talbot on the other hand sent a letter of sound sense offering her services if necessary as a nurse, explaining that she was well experienced in sick nursing and adding somewhat wistfully:

> How much I have envied you—and wished that I had any right to do any thing for him—and might help you in your privileged charge—but from a stranger—I know that is impossible—but if you *should* want a stranger's help—let me know and I will come to you at any time.[1]

When Ruskin had recovered sufficiently to write, he sent a note on Easter Monday to return the money she had so " tenderly

[1] Rylands Eng. MS., Ruskin and Severn Correspondence (30.3.78). This collection has been too recently acquired for final arrangement.

and graciously "[1] lent to Joan, and to warn her that his head was still too weary to be troubled with business or Guild affairs. In May he wrote again, this time to explain emphatically that his cure lay in solitude and that she must not contemplate visiting him. In the summer of 1879 she invited him to Barmouth and he refused vowing that he would leave Brantwood no more. She made a generous bequest to his St. Mark's Fund and he wrote to express his gratitude and to assure her that the world would never come to an end if only it had in it six people as good as herself. He was supremely thankful for her trust and affection or, as he expressed it, for her "unceasing and overflowing" kindness to him no less than to the causes he fought for. One of the greatest services she rendered (to Ruskin certainly it was the most helpful) was her provision of one of her own trained servants at a time of crisis at Brantwood when the harassed Joan Severn contemplated leaving the house. Ruskin made this comment on the situation which must have caused him great distress :

> In the first nervous fever of recovering this time, I wanted to be left quite alone —but have gradually come more back to my old self, and am not going to let Joan leave me at all events till the spring is past. It was not *her*—whom I wished for the moment to send away, but the various disturbing elements of *town* life which invade Brantwood when her kindness is there to receive them—and the illness, this time, has been a very solemn thing to myself (—you know I wrote you a line, when it was coming on)—and I must not make any more mistakes about those flowers on the balcony![2]

In the turmoil of his wearied mind Ruskin believed that St. Ursula (whom he identified often in illness with Rose) had sent him flowers as a mark of favour, and he naturally confided in his friend Mrs. Talbot. It was as natural for him also to confide in her about Brantwood difficulties. It is known from Joan's letters to the Simons that Ruskin frequently turned against his cousin in illness, imagined that she was trying to poison him, and that the men who restrained him in his violent moments were his enemies. Ruskin's fears and suspicions were an obvious part of his illness, but his need for tranquillity and peaceful conditions in which to recuperate was no less obvious. There is every evidence to suggest that Joan welcomed the publicity her position in Ruskin's

[1] Rylands Eng. MS., 1161 '66 (Easter Monday, 1878).
[2] Ibid. 1161 82 (1.4.81).

household gave her : she was eager to have a place in Victorian society, to be seen at Ascot, and to be friends with the most influential of Ruskin's friends and acquaintances—especially with the Duchess of Albany and the Simons. It may be that Ruskin's complaint to Mrs. Talbot about elements of London life at Brantwood when Joan was in residence there was well-founded.

The games of chess continued down the years and as advancing ill-health imposed heavier restrictions on him her letters brought a renewal of interest to long, weary days. He was now glad to give careful answer to her questions about authors, artists, Quarry's future as an artist, drawings worth buying, mutual friends, London exhibitions, new plays and old manuscripts. Interspersed with these answers were sincere expressions of gratitude to her for enabling him to carry out through the Guild of St. George and other projects his principles with her money. She was so much in his thoughts at this time that when, in the early hours of a December morning in 1882, he felt ill and distressed he wrote to her :

I am sitting up at ½ past four in the morning, because I can't lie down, or at least can't sleep, with relaxed sore throat. How I wish you were here, to make me do what I should—or do it for me, and flannel and gruel me to rights. What *is* the best rough & ready way of dealing with these throats that hurt one in swallowing. I've been plagued with them more or less all my life, but this, complicated with some other symptoms of cold has been more than usually tiresome & painful.[1]

When he felt better he presented the argument to her that only those who had suffered illness could fully appreciate the blessings of good health.

It is strange that Mrs. Talbot does not hold an important place in his Diaries ; she is named only a few times and never with any warmth of feeling. He may of course have identified her in his mind with his Guild of St. George and therefore associated her in some way with the dismay he felt at times with his venture. One notable entry made in Geneva on 15 September 1882, refers to "fretting" letters that depressed him ; obviously one of the letters that fretted him was from Mrs. Talbot reporting the interference of the Sanitary Commissioners in the Barmouth property. In his ill-health and weariness he felt the need for

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/92 (29.12.82).

freedom of anxiety from Guild matters, and yet those matters constituted for Mrs. Talbot her easiest road to him. Another possible route to Ruskin was of course through questions about art and contemporary artists. He was pleased when she showed interest in drawings made by Ward of Rouen Cathedral, and he sent a picture to her telling her that if she liked it she must send Ward a cheque for £20, the full market price. If on the other hand she did not wish to buy the picture, then it was to be sent to the Principal of Whitelands College for Schoolmistresses. In this way Ruskin hoped to win Mrs. Talbot's interest in the College. He always expected his friends to share his interest in educational establishments; he introduced Hallé and Burne-Jones to the staff and children at Winnington Academy, and he prevailed on Burne-Jones to design gay stained glass windows for the Whitelands College Chapel. Ruskin longed to bring colour to this worthy but rather dull educational establishment; he felt that life was pursued there at too earnest a level, that gaiety was required, and that the corridors needed pictures to make them "romantic". His generosity was great: rare books, pictures and minerals were among the gifts he carefully selected for the College. He was delighted to sense Mrs. Talbot's curiosity about the May Queen Festival which he had instituted there. The ceremony, as Ruskin planned it, was a simple one in which the students in a flower-decked hall elected a May Queen and crowned her with a garland of primroses and violets. Every year to commemorate the occasion he made arrangements for a specially designed gold cross to be presented to the queen (Ruskin as well as Arthur Severn and Burne-Jones designed some of these crosses); he also gave a set of his books to the queen for distribution among worthy students. Ruskin hoped by instituting this ceremony to foster simply an awareness of the joys of summer, dance and song. He intended that the students should have at least one festive day in the College calendar. He did not approve of the Principal's moral interpretation of the ceremony; he was afraid that Faunthorpe made too much fuss about the occasion and invited thereby unwelcome publicity. Faunthorpe's fears seem to have centred on the danger of the wrong type of student being elected, Ruskin on the other hand

wanted the queen to be gay and to look beautiful. He wrote in frank dismay after studying photographs of the ceremony one year :

I'm rather frightened of my queen. She looks to me between 35 and 38, and rather as if she would bring back the inquisition and trial by the rack.[1]

When Mrs. Talbot referred to Whitelands College he forwarded her letter to Faunthorpe explaining that she was the main support of the Guild of St. George and adding somewhat ruefully :

She never sends me a letter without a question in it needing the forenoon to answer.[2]

He suggested that some of the former May Queens should write and give her a detailed account of student life. He was pleased to learn later of Mrs. Talbot's delight in the queens' letters and assured her that the students would enjoy corresponding with her. A few days later he wrote again :

I should so like you to put the Queen's cross on, next time, unless Joanie can do it—if she is in London, and well it's such a crow for her—but if she can't, then please you do—none has a better right.[3]

Occasionally Mrs. Talbot met with the brusque side of his nature, but she seemed, happily for her, able to ignore his rebuffs and to persuade him to continue the correspondence. Probably her suggestion, made at the end of April 1883, that she should be present at his Oxford lectures brought his angriest reaction :

It is absolutely necessary—whatever the disappointment that *none* of my friends should at present add to the extreme difficulty and dangerous excitement of my work in Oxford. Also—were they to come—ten rooms like the Museum Theatre would not be enough for them—How many hundreds do you think there are in England now—who care for me—I say with fear and thankfulness—they may be counted by more than hundreds.

I am sending severest interdiction to those who care most for me—These lectures are for my pupils in Oxford—*not* my friends in England.

In *this* course more than all others—it is necessary to my very life that no additional excitement should be caused me ;—if I broke down *now*—I could never go on again. I never DREAMED of my friends thinking of coming—they should hold their breath with fear—and now if ever—leave me to my task.[4]

Mrs. Talbot refused to be rebuffed, she made the simpler request that she might be permitted to attend his drawing classes as a

[1] *Letters to Faunthorpe*, I. xxix.
[2] Ibid. II. lxxiv.
[3] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/140 (10.1.85).
[4] Ibid. 1161/100 (n.d.).

pupil. By return Ruskin replied assuring her that he would look at any number of drawings she cared to send him, but that he would not accept her as a pupil. A few days later he was obliged to write in stronger terms :

> You may certainly send me your drawings, to look at, but not just now—
> Remember simply this—that *any* day I may go mad, or fall paralysed—without having had the least warning of my danger—and don't at present add to my work.[1]

Such arguments appear to have carried little weight with Mrs. Talbot ; the following year, in November 1884, she wrote to ask him to sign some drawings and to advise her about a contemplated purchase of the Book of Job. Ruskin gave her the help she required, but when she proceeded to ask for a written criticism of the Book of Job he made angry protest :

> I never give you an inch but you ask six—I have signed the drawings and highly approve of the book of Job—but can absolutely give no criticism. The prices are I should think fair, but don't buy what you don't care for.[2]

Doubtless Mrs. Talbot was partly responsible for his irritated entry in his Diary on 26 November when he complained that he was very angry with various people. It is strange that a woman of Mrs. Talbot's common sense could not realize the burden she was laying on her weary friend who did his best to explain his fears of illness, the dangers for him of over-exertion or even excitement, and the greater danger that lurked in a deceptive feeling of well-being. Moreover, to refuse her requests was an added strain for he was ever conscious of her kindness and her continued generous financial assistance to his Guild of St. George and his work in Italy. Indeed, in December he wrote to thank her for the precious work he had been able to do in Italy through her help, and then, as Christmas approached, he suggested that they began another game of chess by correspondence as a seasonable festivity. Christmas tended to worry him for, as he explained in a letter to Mrs. Talbot, he felt that the true sources of Christmas happiness had ended for him : that his relatives were dead, that he was alone in the world save for Joan Severn, that happiness for him rested only in his work and in being useful to others. Fortunately on this occasion Mrs. Talbot was able to

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/103 (n.d.). [2] Ibid. 1161/127 (n.d.).

grasp his meaning; she did not irritate him with gay card or festive gift to intensify his feelings of loneliness, instead on Christmas Day he was gratified to receive from her a sheet of paper which gave, with her love, the next chess move. Ill with a cold, his depression grew and he frenziedly began to tidy his papers and to try to put things in order. He noted this fact in his Diary on Boxing Day and again on 28 December, as well as in a letter to Mrs. Talbot when he wrote:

I'm a little better but very bad yet,—never was so bad at Xmas before. I am getting things in order—and wondering what's the use of any of them.[1]

Mrs. Talbot succeeded in rousing his interest in the outside world again by her comments on Whitelands College and her questions about Carlyle and his wife. She wooed him into careful answer on his reason for finishing *Fors*:

I finished Fors that I might have time for a businesslike autobiography, saying what good I know of myself and other people in a quiet way.—noting my own principal *known* mistakes in my own business—bookwriting or the like—and leaving all domestic or personal distress to be guessed or gossiped of— by whoever likes to gossip or guess—being assured by me that it's none of their business—and that whatever they guess or say will always be wrong.[2]

He concluded the letter by telling her that his melancholy work of clearing up his papers was proceeding and that he was feeling a little better.

The new year, 1885, found him still at work on his dismal, self-set task which he interrupted to tell Mrs. Talbot of his intention to give her as a keepsake some of his early manuscripts. His decision was motivated not so much by his affection for her as by his awareness of her regard and friendship or, as he wrote:

I am sure I could not leave them to anyone who has cared more kindly for me.[3]

Three days later he informed her that he had posted the cover and most of the sheets of his first sketch book made when he was twelve. He noted in his Diary on 8 January that he had also sent Mrs. Talbot a recently discovered copy of two poems, *Glenfarg* and *The Sun*, which he had written at the age of eight and had presented to his Father on New Year's Day 1828. A few days later he sent her another "scrap" which she thankfully and

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/132 (n.d.). [2] Ibid. 1161/134 (n.d.).
[3] Ibid. 1161/136 (n.d.).

gratefully received. Their chess by correspondence continued; in all she received sixteen letters from him in the month of January. There is evidence of a certain tension in his letter, written on 20 January, when she obliged him to defend his decision to employ Alessandri as an artist for his Guild of St. George and not her son Quarry. He was clearly embarrassed by her troublesome pertinacity and hastened to explain:

> But *of course* Quarry could do better than *any*body but Alessandri, only I didn't want to hamper him—and use his friendship in making him work at things he disliked, & so on—*Business* is very difficult between friends,—when I feel able to give him commissions worth having, it will be another thing.[1]

But Mrs. Talbot, who was not so easily deflected from her objective, successfully reinforced her argument with touching reference to Quarry's declining health, and so won from Ruskin the promise to set him to work as soon as practicable. When that agreement was made, she turned to events at Whitelands College where obviously she was now an accepted visitor, and received this tolerant answer to her curiosity about the Vice-Principal:

> Miss Stanley is only a good sensible schoolmistress—no relation that I know of of any big-drum Stanley.[2]

Next she required him to tell her about the work of Albert Fleming, a well-known Lake District character, from whom she planned ordering some home-spun linen. It is pleasing to be able to record that although Ruskin's entries in his Diary for this period touch on bad dreams and the general discomfort of broken health he could still joke about his interest in girls:

> [Fleming] is on the look-out for *old* women as—sharply as I for scholars of more tender age![3]

While Mrs. Talbot could follow Fleming's interest in the old woman who was likely to have the crafts and skills of a former age to hand on, she could not accept without explanation his reference to his own quest for the younger scholar, and Ruskin sent this gay answer:

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/145 (n.d.).
[2] Ibid. 1161/146 (22.1.85).
[3] Ibid. 1161/149 (n.d.).

—What a lovely innocent question you put to me about the scholars I am seeking. —Pretty girls, beautifully dressed and exquisitely mannered, between the ages of ten & seventeen inclusive.[1]

After such a reply Mrs. Talbot wisely concerned herself in her next letter with the high cost of Mr. Fleming's hand-spun linen, and again she received conclusive answer from him :

—Yes. I suppose the hand linen will always be narrow & dear. Breadth of shuttle-throw—price of Man's Work and Woman's. The Devil's work on the contrary is very broad—and extremely cheap.[2]

For his birthday on 5 February she sent him a letter which he appreciated because it made him realize that he was greatly loved and would be greatly missed ; at her instigation Quarry also sent a birthday letter. The game of chess continued to please him ; he made jocular reference to Joan's supervision of household expenditure when explaining why he had not written to remind her about a move in the game :

I would have tel[egraphe]d it to you—but Joan would have given it me hot—if she'd heard of it ! for wasting a shilling.[3]

Soon after St. Valentine's Day, maybe because of it, or maybe to celebrate the publication of his Report of the Guild of St. George, Mrs. Talbot sent him a cheque for £311 4*s.* 5*d.* On 17 February in a footnote in his Diary Ruskin referred to this cheque and quoted a sentence from her letter in which she explained that this amount represented her exact tithe. He wrote to her on the same day :

Indeed I shall not send it back ! it is a great joy to me. The first Museum gift I have had since the report came out—and the first entirely consenting and happy anticipation of it.—Of course in name or anything else, all shall be as you wish —but I am very very glad to be able to head the Mus. gifts column with it.[4]

A few days later he received a letter from her that reflected her own joy at the gift and he dictated this reply :

What a sweet YOU are! to be so happy in giving away 3 hundred pounds.— Heaven send I may be spared to give you welcome at the Inn Door and take you through the Jewel room.—All the same—I can't let your King come over my way, just now——[5]

and he made a chess move.

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/150 (n.d.).
[2] Ibid. 1161/153 (n.d.).
[3] Ibid. 1161/155 (9.2.86).
[4] Ibid. 1161/159 (17.2.86).
[5] Ibid. 1161/160 (n.d.).

As the game proceeded during these tranquil months his letters reflect a certain happiness and satisfaction. He was pleased with the good progress he was making with the new issue of *Modern Painters*, with the Oxford lectures which he was hoping shortly to complete, and with the daily production of the two pages of *Praeterita* written in the early mornings. Especially he was enjoying his work of editing *The Roadside Songs of Tuscany* written by Francesca Alexander, whom he had lately met and whose true friendship was one of the great blessings of his old age. The source of Ruskin's admiration for Francesca lay in her vivid goodness, in her selfless work among the poor peasants of Tuscany. She devoted most of her time, energy and talent as artist and author to the work of helping the oppressed. To that end she sold her manuscript book, *The Roadside Songs of Tuscany*, to Ruskin for his Walkley Museum for £600; Ruskin himself believed the manuscript to be worth more and offered £1,000, but characteristically the Alexanders refused to accept more than they believed the book to be worth. During the years 1884 and 1885 Ruskin edited *The Songs* which he issued in twelve parts at various dates. It was natural that he should wish to introduce his patron Mrs. Talbot to his protégée, and so he sent her as a gift two of Francesca's drawings from the book. Mrs. Talbot's delight and enthusiasm were boundless; at once she asked innumerable questions about the artist's intention and meaning in her execution of the drawings, and Ruskin was thankful to be able to send her questionnaire on to Francesca herself for answer, then when he received her reply he carefully copied it out for Mrs. Talbot and posted it by way of introducing the ladies to each other. Some days later Ruskin rejoiced to learn that already Mrs. Talbot was planning to call on the Alexanders when next she visited Italy with Quarry and his wife.

Although Ruskin was ever able to interest Mrs. Talbot in the work of deserving artists, she was unable to rouse any lasting interest in Ruskin in the artistic powers of her ailing son. The correspondence suggests that Mrs. Talbot was often gravely concerned about her son's welfare; she was anxious about his health no less than about his inability to find any satisfactory remunerative outlet for his artistic energies and ambition. She

encouraged him to paint and hopefully presented his pictures to Ruskin for his Museum until at length Ruskin made polite protest about the number he was required to accept. Above all she longed for Quarry to be accepted by Ruskin as a promising young artist whose work he valued; unfortunately Quarry proved difficult too: he refused to be guided by Ruskin's advice, persisted in painting in oils and in selecting his own subjects for pictures. At times he was very depressed and his wild and bitter words agitated his mother who pathetically believed that Ruskin would be able to resolve his difficulties. After such an attack in the spring of 1885 she sent one of her son's pictures to Ruskin and asked him to criticize it, but Ruskin, who was never able to appreciate fully Mrs. Talbot's anxiety about her son, ignored the request for an evaluation of Quarry's powers with:

> This is a quite amazing pic of Quarry's—what a wicked old humbug he is to talk of himself so and frighten his mama & me.[1]

and he went on to discuss Francesca's latest letter and to tell her how much he was enjoying the present "curiously exciting" game of chess. On this occasion Mrs. Talbot refused to allow the subject of her son to be passed over so lightly and Ruskin was obliged to reply somewhat insincerely:

> First about that dear Quarry—of course I'll direct him and stimulate him all he likes—but I can't take more of his elaborate drawings in gift to St. G. and I'm as deep in employed draughtsmen properly paid as I can go—but I'll ask Quarry to do for me the things I want and exhibit them—no matter who buys them, so that the things are drawn. Of course old helmets are waste of time.[2]

His letter of greetings on May Day must have given her great pleasure although he made no mention of her son's work, but two days later he wrote asking for Quarry's address so that he could instruct him and set him some work to do. Unhappily the recalcitrant Quarry decided instead to hold an exhibition of his pictures at the Grosvenor Galleries which Ruskin was asked by Mrs. Talbot to visit. He paid two visits to the Gallery on 15 and 22 May. After his first visit he sent a short note in which he praised Quarry's talent for drawing, but indicated his disappointment that the pictures were not as good as the photographs, sent earlier by Mrs. Talbot, suggested. He wrote more

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/209 (n.d.). [2] Ibid. 1161/210 (30.4.85).

cautiously after his second visit and described Quarry's work as good but uncertain in aim. Mrs. Talbot, eager to help her depressed son to recover his interest in art, proposed that they meet in London to discuss the pictures and Ruskin agreed, but insisted that he and Quarry had a private meeting on the subject. They met on Thursday, 11 June, at the home of the friends with whom the Talbots were staying, and six days later, when he had returned to Brantwood, Ruskin made this comment :

Yes, I did think Quarry showed how much suffering that illness must have caused him—but I did not think him " broken' ", only worn, and for some time of course, clouded and blackened in heart—The cloud will pass—the pace quicken again.[1]

For the moment he had succeeded in laying aside the problem of Quarry and his painting.

Meanwhile the game of chess enchanted him, and his work progressed reasonably satisfactorily, but on 28 July she received a letter that gave indication of the shade that was to fall :

My mistake in chess is easily set right ; I wish I could set right as easily the hurt to my leg caused by the fall of a pile of books of which I thought nothing, but which the doctors, professional and unprofessional, of this house declare to mean a good deal of mischief.

They have laid me by for the present, leaving me at least more time to play chess.[2]

Unhappily even chess had to be laid aside and it was not until 9 February 1886 that she heard from him. His letter, which was written primarily to thank her for her cheque of £70 for the Guild of St. George, showed also his delight in being able to write and to receive letters again. Two days later he wrote to thank her for giving him news of Quarry and to ask her to give him the last chess positions of their game of July 1885. The only comment that he made on his illness was that it was the severest he had ever experienced and that it called for greater vigilance of the dangers of fatigue. Mrs. Talbot at first was afraid that even their slow-moving game of chess might weary him, but he quickly assured her that chess constituted his main interest now that work was temporarily banned, and that even French novels had lost their savour. Her questions no longer harried him ; he found pleasure in recommending novels, telling her about his four favourite singers Lablache, Rubini, Tamburini and Grisi, and naming

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/245 (n.d.). [2] Ibid. 1161/264 (25.7.85).

the stars of ballet that appealed to him, paying greatest tribute to the work of Taglioni. She defeated him when she sought his advice on the best play to see when on holiday in London for he had no specific recommendation to make, but he gaily informed her that he would be satisfied with any play in which a pretty girl was acting. Mrs. Talbot reacted in the usual way : she accused him of naughtiness and asked for a reasoned explanation of his view, but Ruskin merely supported more dogmatically than ever his opinion that an essential ingredient of a good play was a pretty girl. As Joan Severn was in London at the time he sought her advice on the subject and enclosed Mrs. Talbot's letter. This action startled Mrs. Talbot who received this surprised comment on her indignant protestations :

Naughty to show my letters to my di ma[1]— ? but I couldn't keep anything to myself—now—or she'd be anxious ! What was the harm ? [2]

She was obliged to accept this view which was reinforced in a second letter :

What a fuss about nothing !—Thinking aloud—Of course you were—so am I always—neither of us need mind anybody seeing our letters—If we thought differently mind—we might.[3]

The chess continued to please him, but he developed another cold in April which with an exhausting cough and choking fits disturbed his nights for some time and added to the daily depression he experienced as he worked his way through old diaries. When he had recovered, the Severns went on holiday, and he remained alone at Brantwood feeling, as he recorded in his Diary, sad and sulky. In answer to Mrs Talbot's consternation he replied on 14 April :

Alone ?—Yes—quite alone—and as sulky as a bear—as the Two Bears together that ate up the wicked children.[4]

The game of chess proved unusually interesting and he wrote to express his enjoyment of it as well as to warn her of the delicate and dangerous state of his health. After that warning she

[1] The reference is to Joan Severn. Ruskin made frequent use of pet-names and baby-talk in letters to close friends.

[2] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/282 (n.d.).

[3] Ibid. 1161/283 (n.d.).

[4] Ibid. 1161/309 (14.4.86).

wearied him no more with Guild affairs. Instead she questioned him about religious matters: versions of the Bible, St. Jerome, the Doctrine of the Trinity, the true meaning of Christianity. Ruskin was amused at Mrs. Talbot's account of her spiritual doubts; he sent her works by writers such as Milner and Bede and teasingly called her a heretic. Nevertheless he was interested enough in her religious views to make special comment on the meaning of Christianity in Part VI of *Praeterita*. He wrote to her about it:

> the 6th will certainly be interesting in a grave way, with the bit put in for your infidel sake, I don't mean written *for you*,—you needn't mind whether you care for it or not,—but *because* of you.[1]

It will be recollected that in *Praeterita*, Chapter VI, Ruskin referred to the number of intelligent and amiable people who were ignorant of the total meaning of Christianity because of their obsession with such issues as the amount of Christianity they accepted as truth, and the amount they were able themselves to believe. He proceeded to state in simple terms the true meaning of Christianity as he understood it. Naturally Mrs. Talbot longed to read this passage and she waited impatiently for its publication. In her excitement she wearied Ruskin who, having whetted her appetite with such promises as:

> you *will* be surprised to see what Christianity means—when I get it set down.[2]

finally grew irritated and wrote somewhat coldly:

> *Your* Christianity indeed!—when did I ever say I'd venture to say a word about *that*!—There's to be a definition of Christianity itself, somewhere.[3]

Despite his irritation he enjoyed the interest her letters brought, as well as the excitement their game of chess gave him. He wanted her to realize that he now had time for her queries and he apologized for his former attitude:

> I am quite glad of chats *now*. I always felt like a brute for not *asking* you to talk—but when I had lectures and things to do—to time—the least addition to the burden told—Now it is no added burden—but a real added pleasure to have your vivid sympathy.[4]

Encouraged by this letter Mrs. Talbot renewed her attempts to

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/327 (17.5.86).
[2] Ibid. 1161/328 (18.5.86).
[3] Ibid. 1161/352 (n.d.).
[4] Ibid. 1161/337 (n.d.).

interest Ruskin in her son. She abandoned her former tactics of trying to work a way through his sympathy by reporting depressing details about Quarry's health or prospects as an artist; instead she wrote giving some confidential information about his father. In his reply Ruskin did not divulge the nature of the information, but he was clearly gratified by her trust in him and he promised to assist Quarry. He received a second confiding letter from her to which he made this reply:

I am most thankful to know—and understand all this about Quarry, while I am still able to use the knowledge, and to be a little to him what I may by his Father's & mother's wish. I do not allow myself to think or feel much about anything just now. But I have great hope and comfort in your letter today.[1]

Mrs. Talbot's third letter on this matter carried the request that he should have another discussion with Quarry about his work, but Ruskin refused to lift his self-imposed ban on visitors, although he agreed to advise him by post. At the same time he complained bitterly about the number of letters he was daily obliged to write: on one occasion he reminded her that hers was the thirty-third letter he had written that day, on another occasion he had written sixteen letters before answering hers. Unabashed, Mrs. Talbot next suggested that he should visit her in Barmouth and complete *Praeterita* there; when he patiently explained that a search through his thirty volumes of diaries was a regular routine for the production of even one sentence in *Praeterita*, and that such work could be undertaken only in his own home, he received by return of post yet another letter from her to which he made this aggrieved reply:

This is the eleventh letter today—two of the eleven being on grave business—one—painful—I have not got a word of books written today—and must get out. Of Quarry I am most thankful to hear as able to go south—but have not a grain of sand left in the hourglass for today.[2]

She had little mercy on his frail state of health—maybe because her need was great—and a few days after she received the above letter she wrote once more, this time to tell him of a great financial loss which she had sustained and to ask if he could find employment for Quarry as an artist. Ruskin was deeply grieved that

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/341 (31.5.86). [2] Ibid. 1161/359 (n.d.).

the most generous of his friends should suffer in this way and he wrote by return :

I can't play chess today for it has been a great sorrow to me to think that you, who have benefited the St. George's Guild of all my friends the most frankly and grandly, should—as if by the fierce enemy of all righteousness—be shortened in your own income and anxious to know what Quarry could do in painting.[1]

In stating his opinion of Quarry as an artist, Ruskin referred to his great and fine power, but stressed his lack of training. He explained that it was impossible in the present state of Guild finances to contemplate employing an untrained artist, but towards the end of the letter he tentatively proposed that Quarry should work in Italy under his direction on, possibly, the same scale of pay as Randal. Mrs. Talbot's eager acceptance of this plan brought from Ruskin a short note in which he stated that he must have more time before he committed himself, but grievous illness intervened and prevented him from ever coming to any decision on the matter.

Chess was over for him for ever now but Mrs. Talbot's kindness remained ; she sent him a message of affectionate greeting on his birthday, 8 February 1888, and he was able to write from Sandgate to thank her for her kind memory of him. The last two letters she received refer to her own sorrow, not his—the death in 1888 of Quarry, her son. Apparently Ruskin felt himself unable to sympathize with her at the time of her bereavement for it was not until the summer of 1889 that he sent her this somewhat inadequate letter :

I have never written since Quarry's death, because I could write no word of comfort to you, being, as I entirely believed, myself dying also, and not dying merely, but without hope of any world beyond, or sight, or salutation, of those gone before us,—or themselves always in heaven.

But all this spring, I have been steadily gaining, and you may have some momentary gladness in sharing my hope that I am yet to carry on, for a few years, in my old ways and works ; and that I look to my mama Talbot with a true feeling of dutiful gratitude for all she has been to me, and the resolve to be in such poor sort as I may, what Quarry would have asked me to be to her, after he was gone.[2]

Mrs. Talbot, who understood the reasons for his long silence, was thankful to have the opportunity to write to him again. In her letter she expressed her feelings of horror at the behaviour of

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/360 (27.6.86). [2] Ibid. 1161/364 (11.6.89).

Quarry's widow who had married again only a short time after his death. Characteristically she had a question to ask and a request to make, and in writing his last letter to her Ruskin gave her gentle answer :

14th June, 1889.

Dearest Mama Talbot

It *is* " too soon "—indeed ! I have never been more sorrowfully amazed by woman's—what is it to be rightly called—aspen variableness—or opal variableness ? I do not think Quarry could have loved her, if she had been heartless or hard—and when the flickering light of her was caught by him—or the gleam of the flickering leaf—I suppose it was enough for him—But he was himself so tender and so wise and strong—that how anyone could succeed him in a woman's heart utterly silences one for shame of—what any of them call their hearts—its really as if they hadn't got anything but . . .

Yes, send me, two at a time, Quarry's last drawings to see.—He *was* getting on ! and—*you* need not be troubled as if his advance had ceased. I have myself got back to something like hope of being able to paint—in the sky—with ray of real sunset—on the real clouds.

I can't go on writing today for I was very busy yesterday and did'nt sleep well, partly being too triumphant over a little bit of wicked fencing—with my dear friend Norton—buttons off the foils !—I'll write again tomorrow with Francesca's letter—not findable yet—You know—I can't keep Joan running about after me to pick things up all day !

Ever your lovingest

Quarry's—chess captive—

J. Ruskin.[1]

And on that warm and happy note of friendship the correspondence ceased, for the dire illness of August 1889 left him incapacitated for further sustained mental effort.

Mrs. Talbot's sense of loneliness and loss must have been intensified by the knowledge that Ruskin still lived, still needed help and attention, although he was abstracted from the outside world. Her affectionate regard for him apparently carried a natural resentment of those Companions on whom responsibility for Guild affairs now fell ; particularly she resented George Baker and the authority that his position as trustee gave him. To Mrs. Talbot the Guild of St George could have only one Master, whose death brought its dissolution. In her mind even the Walkley Museum assumed a certain elegaic character, and she wrote emphatically to the Curator :

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/365 (14.6.89).

I cannot but regret that you think it desirable to *add* to the Ruskin Museum. It seems to me that all Mr. Ruskin himself placed there should ever be kept apart from everything else.[1]

Viewed in the light of these words her visit to Brantwood during the period of his life-in-death existence there may be regarded as a pilgrimage. Certainly her young hostess found her a dramatic figure and noted in a letter to her mother, Mrs. Severn :

No words can tell how brave Mrs. Talbot is. Everything here must be " fraught with sad memories " as novels say, and yet she is quite cheerful ; only now & then one hears *such* a sigh. With all your preparation I couldn't help being took aback by her appearance, but her eyes light up as you say.[2]

Doubtless Mrs. Talbot sighed many times for John Ruskin in his tragic plight, but she had his 365 letters to guide her and, mindful of his teaching, she set about interesting herself in Ruskin-like projects : to that end she supported Canon Rawnsley and other public-minded citizens in the work of founding the National Trust, and she continued to give financial support to Francesca Alexander's great social work among the poor in Tuscany. She had gained from her friendship with Ruskin a new awareness of suffering and social obligation, a new understanding of art and literature ; and as she pored over Ruskin's letters, which she bequeathed to Canon Rawnsley, she could re-assess the warmth of their friendship, reassure herself of his gratitude to her, and find especial comfort in his admission :

I never think of you or yours without what word or thought of blessing is in me.[3]

[1] Rylands Eng. MS. 1164/24.

[2] Ruskin and Severn Correspondence in the John Rylands Library. See p. 463 n. 1.

[3] Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/189 (8.4.85).

A RUMANIAN MANUSCRIPT MISCELLANY IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

By E. D. TAPPE, M.A., F.S.A.,
LECTURER IN RUMANIAN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

AMONG the Slavonic manuscripts acquired by the Rylands Library from the collections of the late Rabbi Gaster is one Rumanian manuscript, no. 2094. The Rumanian part of the Gaster collection of manuscripts was acquired by the Rumanian Academy Library after the Rabbi's death ; but this codex must have been overlooked. It is an eighteenth-century miscellany of Orthodox texts, in which the first and longest item is *Minunile Precistei* (The Miracles of the Virgin). Its scribe was Matei Voileanu, several manuscripts by whom are already known. Some of these were published with a biographical notice by his great-great-grandson of the same name.[1] There exists among Gaster papers at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in the University of London a fragment of a nineteenth-century catalogue of Voileanu manuscripts.[2] MS. 2094 can be identified as " VII " in this catalogue.

Some dates in the life of Logofătul Matei Voileanu Bătrânul (to give him the appellations by which he is distinguished from descendants of the same name) can be fixed from notes which he made in his manuscripts. In 1736 he was at the monastery of Bistriţa in the county of Vâlcea in Wallachia ; in 1740 at the monastery of Drăguş near Făgăraş in Transylvania ; from 1743-61 he lived in the parish of Hundorf in the county of Târnava-mică (also in Transylvania), from which he moved to Şoimuşul-românesc in the same county. His life therefore seems to have been spent in a fairly restricted area in the south of Transylvania and the north of Wallachia, partly in the service of monasteries. But he was not a monk ; he was a lay scribe, a married man with children.

[1] M. Voileanu, *Codicele Matei Voileanu*, Sibiu, 1891.
[2] See the Appendix, p. 490.

Rylands Gaster MS. 2094 contains 180 leaves (235 × 180 mm.), and is bound in a cloth binding typical of Gaster's library. A modern foliation has missed one leaf between fols. 113 and 114; this I refer to as fol. 113 (*a*). Most of the table of contents (*Insemnarea*) has been lost: fol. 1 contains the titles of no. 13-55 of the Miracles of the Virgin, fol. 2^{r} those of the contents of fols. 142^{v}-60.[1] On fol. 2^{v} is a drawing of the Virgin and Child enthroned, with a note "Ma<θei> Vo<ileanu> 1768". Then, since fol. 3 is numbered as leaf 2, it is clear that the first leaf of the text of the Miracles of the Virgin is missing also. The Miracles, which occupy fols. 3-105^{v}, are as follows:

1. [The title and part of the text are missing. For the contents see p. 485.]
2. *Pentru naşterea pruncului şi pentru moartea maica sa, cum au înviat* (Concerning the birth of the baby and the death of its mother, how she came to life again).
3. *Pentru Ion croitoriul* (Concerning John the tailor).
4. *Pentru minunile care s'au făcut în Neoria* (Concerning the miracles which were done in Neorion).
5. *Pentru adăparea orbului* (Concerning the giving of water to the blind man).
6. *Pentru tămăduirea de piatră* (Concerning healing of the stone).
7. *Pentru mortul ce poftise să ajungă la izvorul cel de viaţă priimitoriu* (Concerning the dead man who had desired to reach the spring that receives life).[2]
8. *Pentru darul ce au luat Roman cântăreţul dela cea prea curată fecioară* (Concerning the gift that Romanus the singer received from the most Immaculate Virgin).
9. *Pentru credinţa pravoslaviei şi pentru râul ce eşia din matcă de făcea mare înecătură* (Concerning the faith of orthodoxy and concerning the river which came out of its bed and made a great flood.)
10. *Pentru tăiarea mâinii Sfintului Ioan Damaschin* (Concerning the cutting off of the hand of St. John Damascene).
11. *Pentru fata alde împărat ce i s'au tăiat mânile* (Concerning an emperor's daughter, whose hands were cut off).
12. *Pentru Maria călugăriţa ce ş-au scos ochii de i-au trimis lui Ricardie* (Concerning the nun Maria who removed her eyes and sent them to Richard).
13. *Pentru Eufimia, cum nu ş-au ales mire pământesc* (Concerning Euphemia, how she did not take for herself an earthly bridegroom).
14. *Pentru doao fecioare, cum s'au încun<un>at dela înger cu cununi de trandafir pentru curăţiile lor* (Concerning two maidens, how they were crowned by the angel with crowns of roses for their chastity).
15. *Pentru călugărul chelariu ce iubia vinul, iar avea şi dragostea rugăciunii* (Concerning the cellarer monk who loved wine, but also had the love of prayer).

[1] The compiler of the catalogue mentioned above describes the table of contents as missing as far as the point where fol. 2^{r} begins, so fol. 1 must at that time have been detached and mislaid.

[2] "The spring that receives life" is a name of the Virgin.

16. *Pentru un călugăr ce s'au lepădat de icoana preacisstii cu jurământ* (Concerning a monk who abjured the Virgin's icon).
17. *Pentru Aglaida posadnica lui Petru Preotul, cum s'au mântuit de păcatul curviei* (Concerning Aglais, the concubine of Peter the Priest, how she was saved from the sin of fornication).
18. *Pentru o călugăriță ce să înșăla de vrăjmașul* (Concerning a nun who was deceived by the Enemy).
19. *Pentru sihastrii ce lăcuia în părțile Siriei* (Concerning the hermits who dwelt in the parts of Syria).
20. *Pentru muzicașul Ioan Cucuzel* (Concerning the musician John Cucuzel).
21. *Pentru cum s'au zidit lavra cea mare a Athonului, la câți ani s'au zidit dela facerea lumii* (Concerning how the great monastery of Athos was built; how many years it was built after the creation of the world).
22. *A lui Petru Athonit cinstiitorului de Dumnezeu* (Of Peter of Athos, who honoured God).
23. *Pentru lepădarea și întoarcerea lui Carulos* (Concerning the apostasy and reconversion of Charles).
24. *Pentru lepădarea și întoarcerea lui Theofil din credință* (Concerning Theophilus's apostacy and reconversion to the faith).
25. *Videnia celui de bună rudă* (The vision of the man of good family).
26. *Pentru boiariul cel judecătoriu ce s'au înnecat și au înviat* (Concerning the noble judge who was drowned and came to life).
27. *Pentru cel ce nu putea să învețe Sfinta carte* (Concerning the man who could not learn Scripture).
28. *Pentru înnecarea unui copil* (Concerning the drowning of a child).
29. *Pentru jidovul ce l-au robit tâlharii* (Concerning the Jew whom the robbers enslaved).
30. *Pentru nașterea jidovcei și pentru botezul jidovului* (Concerning the child-birth of the Jewess and the baptism of the Jew).
31. *Pentru îndelungarea vieții călugărului* (Concerning the prolonging of the monk's life).
32. *Pentru cearta celor doi călugări* (Concerning the quarrel of the two monks).
33. *Pentru ostașul ce s'au pocăit* (Concerning the soldier who repented).
34. *Pentru clericul ce să hrănea cu scrisoarea lui* (Concerning the clerk who fed himself with his writing).
35. *Pentru moartea copilului cel aplecătoriu și cum au înviat din morți* (Concerning the death of the suckling child and how it came to life from the dead).
36. *Pentru copilul cel de Jidov carele s'au pricestuit cu ceilalți copii creștinești* (Concerning the Jewish child and how it received Communion with the other Christian children).
37. *Pentru muiarea ce au căzut în păcat cu fiul ei* (Concerning the woman who fell into sin with her son).
38. *Pentru muiarea ce au zămislit în sâmbăta Paștilor* (Concerning the woman who conceived on Easter Saturday).
39. *Pentru dascălul ce nu credea fecioria Preacistei* (Concerning the teacher who did not believe in the virginity of Mary).
40. *Pentru călugărul ce petrecea cu leane multă* (Concerning the monk who lived in great sloth).

41. *Pentru preotul ce să îndoia spre stăpânescul trup* (Concerning the priest who doubted about the Lord's body).
42. *Pentru pocăința ucigașilor jidovi* (Concerning the repentance of the Jewish murderers).
43. *Minunea care s'au făcut în Rîm. Pentru moartea de ciumă* (The miracle which was done in Rome. Concerning the death by plague).
44. *Pentru Ioan zugravul* (Concerning John the painter).
45. *Pentru întristăciunea sărăciei* (Concerning the gloom of poverty).
46. *Pentru slăbănoaga ce nu putea mearge la besearică* (Concerning the cripple who could not go to church).
47. *Pentru fecioara ce au vorbit cu Hristos cocon mic* (Concerning the maiden who spoke to the little baby Christ).
48. *Pentru fecioara ce au lăcuit cu mirele ei în curăție* (Concerning the maiden who dwelt with her bridegroom in chastity).
49. *Pentru tâlhariul ce ucidea și făcea jafuri multe* (Concerning the robber who murdered and did many thefts).
50. *Poveastă pentru un om hulitoriu de Dumnezeu ce s'au jucat în cărți* (Concerning a blasphemer of God who played cards).
51. *Pentru Theodorit jidovul* (Concerning Theodoretos the Jew).
52. *Pentru o muiare ce nu ș-au ispovăduit păcatul său* (Concerning a woman who did not confess her sin).
53. *Pentru cliricul carele au curvit, și în râu s'au înnecat, și din morți au înviat* (Concerning the clerk who fornicated, and was drowned in the river, and came to life from the dead).
54. *Pentru un oștean tâlhariu carele făcea rugă în toate zilele, pentru aceaia nu s'au omorît de diiavolul* (Concerning a soldier robber who prayed every day, and therefore was not killed by the devil).
55. *Pentru văduva cea săracă căriia i-au luat sufletul prea curata fecioară, iar la moartea bogatului au venit diavolul* (Concerning the poor widow whose soul the most Immaculate Virgin took, while at the death of the rich man the devil came).
56. *Pentru săracul ce s'a rănit din văzduh pentru puțina hulă, și s'au vindecat de născătoarea lui Dumnezeu* (Concerning the poor man who was wounded from the sky for his little blasphemy, and was healed by the Mother of God).
57. *Pentru un copil ce nu s'au ars de foc* (Concerning a child who was not burnt by the fire).
58. *Pentru orbul cel din naștere care l-au luminat Precista* (Concerning the man blind from birth to whom the Virgin gave light).
59. *Pentru cela ce s'au mântuit dintru apa mării* (Concerning the man who was saved from the water of the sea).
60. *Pentru ceia ce s'au mântuit de furtună* (Concerning the woman who was saved from the storm).
61. *Videnie minunată a oarecăruia om milostivu și cinstitoriu către prea curata a lui Dumnezeu născătoare* (Wondrous vision of a certain merciful man who honoured the most Immaculate Mother of God).
62. *Minune straşnică. Pentru ascultarea către părinți și către Sfinta Liturghie* (Fearful miracle. Concerning obedience to parents and to the Holy Liturgy).

63. *Pentru doi copii carii surpându-să casa pe ei s'au păzit nevătămaţi de preacista* (Concerning two children who, when the house fell on them, were kept unharmed by the Virgin).
64. *Pentru cela ce au căzut de pe zid şi s'au struncinat, şi de născătoarea de Dumnezeu s'au vindecat* (Concerning the man who fell off the wall and was smashed, and was healed by the Mother of God).
65. *Pentru minunea ce să face la fântâna Thrapsan şi pentru firea unor ape* (Concerning the miracle which is done at the spring of Thrapsanon and concerning the nature of some waters).
66. *Vedeare minunată, cum că Domnul către noi să îmblânzeaşte cu ale Maicii rugăciuni plecându-să* (Wondrous vision, how that the Lord is gracious unto us, being moved by the prayers of his Mother).

Cartojan divides the Rumanian versions of the Miracles of the Virgin into three types.[1] One of these is based on the compilation of the Cretan monk Agapios (born Athanasios Landos), published at Venice in 1641 with the title Ἁμαρτωλῶν Σωτηρία. The second is based on the work of a Ruthenian monk Galeatovski, published at Lvov in 1655. The third is a contamination of these two works. The version in our manuscript is of the Agapios type. It contains sixty-six of the sixty-nine miracles in Agapios. Those omitted are :

A26. "Concerning the woman who bore a black child . . ."
A27. "Concerning a certain monastery which was unexpectedly helped in extreme necessity by the Mother of God."
A59. "Concerning the leper who was cured and went to a monastery."

The correspondence between the Voileanu and Agapios series is as follows :

V2-25 = A2-25
V26-56 = A28-58
V57-66 = A60-69

In view of this correspondence it is reasonable to assume that V1, of which only an illegible fragment remains, was parallel to A1 (Concerning the blinded Jews, and the man whose hands were cut off and who was healed by the Mother of God after believing in Christ).

At the end of this section is written :

" anu αψξη Mai κζ de zile
mi s'au scris de Log<o>făt Matθei Voileanu
bătrânul în Şoimuş românesc "

(the year 1768, May 27, written for me by Scribe Matei Voileanu Senior at Şoimuşul-românesc).

[1] N. Cartojan, *Cărţile populare în literatura românească*, II, p. 121.

The second section of the miscellany begins on fol. 106^{r} with " Rugăciune cătră prea sfinta de Dumnezeu născătoarea " (Prayer to the most holy Mother of God). Then from fol. 106^{v} to 111^{r} we have four parables from the story of " Varlaam " and " Ioasaf ". This romance, *Varlaam and Iosafat*, a Christianized version of the Buddha story, was very widely disseminated in many languages, and had been translated into Rumanian from a Slavonic version in the seventeenth century by Udriște Năsturel, a Wallachian boyar. The four parables contained in our miscellany are " The Unicorn " (" Inorogul "), " The three friends ", "The king elected for one year " and " The four boxes ". The wording, however, is not identical with that of Năsturel.

On fol. 111^{r} follows a story of St. Basil the Great : *Pentru un preot ce au trăit* 170 *de ani* (Concerning a priest who lived 170 years). On the recto of an unnumbered leaf between fols. 111 and 112 is *Istoria sfintului arhangel Gavriil când au slujit la un sihastru ani* 30 (Story of the holy archangel Gabriel when he served a hermit 30 years). On fol. 112^{v} is *Istoria unui împărat foarte scump* (Story of a very grasping emperor), which does not appear to be connected with any saint. This ends on the recto of another unnumbered leaf between fols. 113 and 114, and is followed by a note on the authors of the non-Pauline epistles in the New Testament.

On fol. 114^{r} a new heading introduces a series of miracles of St. Nicholas. There are seventeen of them, as follows :

1. *După pristăvire* (After his death).
2. *Cum au izbăvit o corabie de potop* (How he rescued a ship from the flood).
3. *Pentru fiul lui Agric Vasilie* (Concerning Vasile, son of Agric).
4. *Pentru popa Hristofor, cum sfintul Nicolae l-au izbăvit de tăiarea sabiei* (Concerning the priest Christopher, how St. Nicholas rescued him from the cut of the sword).
5. *Pentru oarecare Sarachin, pre care sfintul Nicolae l-au răpit din temniță* (Concerning a certain Saracen, whom St. Nicholas rescued from prison).
6. *Pentru trei icoane* (Concerning three icons).
7. *Pentru un Petru oarecare, căpetenie de oști, pre care sfintul Nicolae l-au izbăvit din temniță* (Concerning a certain Peter, captain of soldiers, whom St. Nicholas saved from prison).
8. *Pentru oarecare om Dimitrie, pre care l-au izbăvit de înecare* (Concerning a certain man, Demetrius, whom he saved from drowning).
9. *Pentru oarecare înecat, pre care sfintul Nicolae l-au păzit viu* (Concerning a drowned man, whom St. Nicholas kept alive).

10. *Pentru Ştefan, craiul sârbesc, cum după orbirea ochilor sfintul Nicolae cu deagetul l-au vindecat* (Concerning Stephen, King of Serbia, how after his blinding St. Nicholas healed him with his finger).
11. *Pentru aceştaş crai Ştefan* (Concerning the same King Stephen).

[After this comes a title with an explanatory note : *Pentru omul înecat în mare. Nu o am scris, că iaste în poucenie* (Concerning the man drowned in the sea. I have not written it, as it is in the " Teaching ").]

12. *Pentru sluga cea nevinovată la furtişag* (Concerning the servant innocent of theft).
13. *Pentru Simeon* (Concerning Simeon).
14. *Pentru un tânăr anume Nicolae* (Concerning a youth named Nicholas).
15. *Pentru un covor* (Concerning a carpet).
16. *Pentru mănăstirea lui ce sărăcise, cum o au îmbogăţit cu aur* (Concerning his monastery which had grown poor, how he enriched it with gold).
17. *Pentru polovceanul care s-au făcut în cetatea Kievului* (Concerning the Polovtsian <prisoner> . . . in the city of Kiev).

This section ends on fol. 147^{v} with the following note : *anu αψξη zile κ Iunie* (the year 1768, 20 June).

On this same page (147^{v}) Voileanu writes a doxology and an apologia for his work :

Pentru început mărire celui făr de început. Pentru sfârşit slavă celui făr de sfârşit. Dau unuia în troiţă proslăvit Dumnezeu, Tatăl, Fiul şi sfintul Duh. Carele a îndemnat a să începe şi au ajutat a să săvârşi cu scrisoarea această sfintă şi minunată carte a minunilor prea sfintei de Dumnezeu născătoarei şi pururea fecioarei Mariei. Şi ale celui dintru sfinţi părintelui nostru Nicolae. Deci tuturor cărora să va întâmpla a ceti pre această carte, cu plecăciune mă rog, ca unde veţi afla în scrisoare greşit să nu defăimaţi, ci cu duhul blândeţelor să îndreptaţi. Că nu numai de cea obicinuită slăbiciune a firii omeneşti, ci şi de bătrâneţe şi de alte multe împotriviri ale streinătăţii fiind cuprins şi hârtia încă nu prea bună fiind, ştiu că multe cu neplăceare să vor afla. Ci iarăş mă rog să îndreptaţi şi pre mine nevreadnicul să mă ertaţi, că toţi să ne învrednicim ertării dela milostivul Domnul nostru Is<us> H<ri>s<tos>, Amin. Mai mic şi plecat a tuturor Log<o>fă<tu>l Matθei Voileanu bătrânul, scris în Şoimuşul rumânesc. (For beginning I magnify Him that is without beginning, for end I give glory to Him that is without end, the glorious God, one in three, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Who urged the beginning and aided the completion of writing this holy and wondrous book of the miracles of the holy Mother of God, the ever-virgin Mary, and of the holy Nicholas, our father, the great hierarch. Therefore to all those to whom it shall happen to read this book, I humbly pray that where you find error in this writing, you will not say evil, but with the spirit of gentleness will correct. For being filled not only with the usual weakness of human nature, but also with old age and many other difficulties from alien folk, and the paper too not being very good, I know that many shortcomings will be found. But again I pray you to correct them and to forgive me, the unworthy one, that we may all be made worthy of forgiveness from our merciful Lord Jesus Christ. Amen. The least and humblest of all, Scribe Matei Voileanu Senior. Written in Şoimuşul-românesc.)

As it were a postscript to this section is a prayer to St. Nicholas on fol. 148r, followed on the verso by an episode from the life of St. Gerasimos: *Pentru poslușania leului* (Concerning the lion's service). Finally on fol. 149v two other hands have written:

O prea minunate și prea slăvite lucrurile tale, părinte Nicolae, că nu iaste cu putință să spue cât de puțân din minunile cele lucrate de tine, cinstite părinte! Fie numele D[o]mnului [1] bine cuvântat de acum și până în veac. (O most wondrous and glorious are thy works, father Nicholas, for it is not possible to tell the least part of the miracles wrought by thee, honoured father! Be the name of the Lord blessed now and henceforth for ever!)

From this point in the Miscellany the hagiographical texts give way almost entirely to liturgical matter. The third section begins on fol. 151r with a funeral oration, entitled in the table of contents *Cazanie la îngroparea omului mort* (Sermon at the burial of the dead man) and headed in the text *Cuvânt și învățătură de folos, la moartea omului creștin; ascultați fraților și părinților!* (Useful word and teaching at the death of the Christian man; hearken, brethren and parents!). On fol. 153v is *Ertăciune la oameni morți* (absolution for the dead). After this, on fol. 155v, is another note by the scribe:

"17 *Logofăt Matθei Voilean<u>* 68
30 *în Șoimuș* *Maii*"

(Scribe Matei Voileanu, 30 May, 1768).

Fol. 156r has a note on Predestination; fol. 156v an interpretation of part of Psalm 94. On the verso of fols. 157-8-9 we have Slavonic texts, with a Rumanian version on the opposite rectos. Fol. 158r has *Poruncire a marelui Vasilie* (Commandment of Basil the Great), *Iară a aceluiaș marelui Vasilie altă poruncire* (Another commandment of the same Basil the Great), and *Arătare pentru câte metanii în marele post* (showing the number of rosaries in Lent). On fol. 159r is *Adaugere pentru scurtarea postului cu liturghiile și cu psaltirea* (Appendix concerning the shortening of the fast. With liturgies and Psalter), and *Din viața Sfintului Andrei cel nebun pentru Hristos* (From the life of St. Andrew, the madman for Christ). On fol. 160r *Și din otečnic cuvânt* (Word from the Pateric).

[1] The word "Domnului" is very doubtful.

Below these parallel versions is a collection of moral aphorisms, beginning at the bottom of fol. 159^{v} with the words: " Călugărul care se pleacă întru întoarcere, duce-l-va Dumnezeul cu ceia cei lucrează fără de lege " (The monk who turns back, him shall God take with those that work unrighteousness). These aphorisms are drawn not only from the Bible, but also from later Christian writers—Quadratus, Evagrius, Chrysostom—and from the pagan Plutarch.

Învăţături preoteşti (Instructions for priests) is the heading of a new section beginning on fol. 161^{r}; the last section of the manuscript. The opening words are " Preotul şi diaconul spre slujirea dumnezeeştii liturghii ieste datori să fie curat " (The priest and deacon must be clean for the celebration of the divine liturgy). The headings of sections are as follows:

fol. 161^{v}: *Pentru vreamea sfintei slujbe* (Concerning the time of the holy service); fol. 163^{v}: *Pentru materia tainei a însuşi trupul lui Hristos* (Concerning the material of the mystery of the very body of Christ); and *Pentru materia sângelui lui Hristos* (Concerning the material of Christ's blood); fol. 164^{r}: *Pentru întâmplările care pot a să întâmpla în materii* (Concerning the accidents which can happen in the materials); fol. 165^{v}: *Pentru întâmplarea de materia sângelui lui Hristos* (Concerning the accident of the material of the blood of Christ); fol. 166^{v}: *Pentru întâmplarea sfinţirii şi a săvârşirii sfintelor daruri* (Concerning the accident of the consecration and perfecting of the holy gifts); fol. 167^{r}: *Pentru întâmplarea nesăvârşirii de preotul ce slujaşte* (Concerning the accident of the priest not completing the celebration); fol. 175^{r}: *Pentru darul primirii, şi pentru paza şi închinăciunea D<u>m<ne>zeeştilor taini* (Concerning the grace of reception, and the keeping and worship of the divine mysteries).

Finally, when the text ends on fol. 178^{v}, we have the following note:

Aceaste scrisori le-am aflat tipărite din Râmnic în anul αψμθ. Iară acum le-am scris eu Logofă<tu>l Matθei Voileanul Bătrânul, când am săzut în Şoimuşul românesc, în anul αψξη dech<emvrie> 31 (These writings I found printed at Râmnic in the year 1749. And now I have written them, Scribe Matei Voileanu Senior, when I lived at Şoimuşul Românesc, in the year 1768, Dec. 31).

Such then are the contents of Rylands Gaster MS. 2094. It does not throw new light on the biography of Matei Voileanu. The latest part of the previously published Voileanu manuscript (*Codicele Matei Voileanu*) dates from the same year, 1768, as does this manuscript; in fact the scribe seems to have started on our miscellany within a few weeks of finishing the other. One point,

however, may be noted. Matei Voileanu's great-great-grandson of the same name, in editing the Codex, inclined to the view that the scribe had no books at hand after leaving the monastery of Drăguș in 1741, and was writing from memory.[1] This seemed antecedently improbable. And now that we have the note " aceaste scrisori le-am aflat tipărit din Râmnic în anul 1749 ", it is clear that he must have had access to at least one book, a copy of the *Preoția* printed at Râmnic in 1749.[2] And if to one, why not to others ?

The manuscripts of Matei Voileanu were used by him and his descendants, until well into the second half of the nineteenth century, for reading aloud. Young men and old gathered on Sundays and holy days at the Voileanu house to listen to the lives of the saints or to romances such as *Archir and Anadan* or to legends from the Byzantine chronographers such as the *History of Troy*. No doubt other such centres existed in Transylvania, and in Wallachia and Moldavia as well. Then, as more people learned to read and facilities for printing increased, this literature was circulated in cheap booklets which found a ready sale. The publication of such booklets continued in Rumania at least until the Second World War. At Christmas 1958[3] the Rumanian Orthodox See in America announced that it had amassed a stock of such books for the edification of the members of its congregations. Here is an aspect of what Iorga called " Byzance après Byzance ".

APPENDIX

Fragment of a catalogue of Voileanu MSS.[4]

The fragment was bound up by Dr. Gaster as " MS. 214 " and has a heading in pencil " Catalog MSS. Voileanu ". It is written in a nineteenth-century hand (C^1). Another hand (C^2) has added and corrected. Bound up with the sheets is an envelope in which they were evidently posted to Dr. Gaster from Transylvania. The stamps have been removed, but the registration label from

[1] M. Voileanu, op. cit. p. 143.

[2] I. Bianu and N. Hodoș, *Bibliografia românească veche*, ii. 110.

[3] *Solia*, 21 December 1958, p. 12.

[4] At the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in the University of London.

Nagy-Szeben (Sibiu) remains, and there is an English postmark on the back of the envelope, " Maida Vale FE 24 97 ".

The fragment contains particulars of manuscripts numbered from V to XVI, and may be summarized as follows

V. Copy of a pastoral letter sent from Râmnic in 1761 to the Rumanians in Transylvania to encourage them to remain faithful to Orthodoxy and not to unite with the Church of Rome.

VI. *Prăznicar.* 127 folios. The section of the *Minei* (*Μηναῖον*) from 1 September to 25 December, copied by Matei Voileanu Senior. C[1] says it was copied 1761-8. C[2] quotes a note on fol. 58 : " Să se ştie că acest prăznicariu al popii Vasilie din Hundorf, şi s'au scris de dascălul Mateiu din Şoimuş, iară cine s'ar întâmpla a-l fura, să fie sub blestemul celor 318 sfinţi Părinţi dela Nichea " (Be it known that this book of saints belongs to the priest Vasilie of Hundorf and was written by the cantor Mateiu in Şoimuş ; may whoever chances to steal it be under the curse of the 318 holy fathers of Nicaea).

VII. The Miscellany described in the article.

VIII. 17 folios. *Pentru împăratul Amfilog, care a vrut să arză biserica Ierusalimului* (Concerning the emperor Amphilochus, who wanted to burn the church of Jerusalem).[1] In the writing of Mateiu Voileanu Junior (1743-1818).

IX. 1. Life of Peter of Athos.[2] 29 folios.
2. *Pentru un copil ce s'au ars* (Concerning a child which was burned). 2 folios.
Written by Mihai Sân Petru of Hodaia Vizirului in 1755, and corrected by Matei Voileanu Senior.
3. *Pentru sfinta pricestanie* (Concerning the holy communion). Written by Matei Voileanu Senior.
4. Glorification of the almighty power of God. 8 folios.
5. *Pentru fiinţa lui Dumnezeu* (Concerning the being of God). 10 folios.
4 and 5 are in the same hand as 1 and 2.
6. From " Simeon Soluneanul " (Simeon of Thessalonica) on the graces of prayer. 2 folios.
7. On the interpretation of holy scripture.[3] 1½ folios. Written at Hundorf, 26 March 1755, by Matei Voileanu Senior.

X. Loose leaves.
1. Fragment of a poem in honour of the Virgin.
2. A poem about Joseph sold by his brethren.
3. Fragment of a poem about Adam.
4. The tale of Archir and Anadan.
5. A poem on the power of God over the whole world.

[1] This tale is translated from the *Annales* of Baronius, according to N. Cartojan, *Cărţile populare în literatura românească*, ii. 179.

[2] A translation of the life written by Grigorios Palamas.

[3] Simeon of Thessalonica, *Περὶ τῆς Θείας προσευχῆς*.

6. *Povestea poamelor* (Tale of the fruits).
7. Questions and answers, e.g. "Q. How often did the Virgin go to Christ's tomb? A. Three times. First, alone . . ." Dated 3 March 1809.

XI. Questions and answers about marriage customs. 4 folios. Written in 1796 by Matei Voileanu Junior.

XII. The apocryphal legend of the letter sent by God from Heaven, which fell at Jerusalem. 8 folios. Written in 1796 by Matei Voileanu Junior.

XIII. 1. Poem to the Virgin, beginning: "O prea milostivă maică" (O most merciful mother).
2. Poem about Adam, beginning: "Veniţi toţi cei din Adam" (Come, all ye that are of Adam!)
3. *Invăţătură la vremea de apoi* (Sermon on the Last Judgement). 5 folios. Written by Vasile Stănilovici of Avrig, 12 March 1787.
4. Poem *O prea frumoasă pustie* (O beauteous desert).
5. Fragment on the creation and fall of Adam. 2 folios.
4 and 5 are in the same hand as 1-3.

XIV. Accounts for building the church and for church wine.[1]

XV. Copy written in 1781 by Jacob Dănişian of a book *Osteneală de aur* (The Golden Labour).[2] 245 folios.

XVI. Fragment of a printed book—dated 1680 by C, but corrected (by Dr. Gaster?) to 1760—containing antiphons, etc.

I have to thank Mr. E. Turdeanu, who encouraged me to examine Rylands Gaster MS. 2094, and who has helped me with his advice.

[1] The church in question is presumably at Şoimuş.

[2] *Πόνημα χρυσοῦν*, No. 712 in E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique du dix-huitième siècle.*

STAGING AND SCENERY IN THE ANCIENT GREEK THEATRE [1]

By T. B. L. WEBSTER, M.A., Hon. Litt.D.
PROFESSOR OF GREEK, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON

THE publication of Menander's *Dyskolos*, dated by an almost certain emendation in 316 B.C., gives us, with much else, information about the staging and scenery of an early New Comedy, produced only some fourteen years after the rebuilding of the Athenian theatre by the statesman Lycurgus.[2] Discussion of this will be the end of our survey ; the later Hellenistic theatre, in which the actors performed on a high stage, is a logical development from the Lycurgan theatre : the picture frame in which the actors appear is completed by the provision of a bottom edge. But that only happened when the creative period of drama was over. The interesting questions are these : when and under what compulsions was the picture frame created, what preceded it and what different compulsions were then operative. The reason for reopening this question is that other evidence besides the *Dyskolos* has been discovered, and some of the old evidence can with profit be reconsidered, but I shall allude to points already rightly established only in so far as they are necessary to complete the story.

Before trying to interpret, I will state the agreed excavational facts about the Athenian theatre :

1. The old (and probably original) temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus,[3] in whose honour the City Dionysia with its dramatic performances was held, lies just below the theatre and from the material and method of building must be pre-Persian, i.e. earlier than 480 B.C., and is probably much earlier. An approximate

[1] A lecture delivered in the Library series of public lectures.

[2] On the date 330-326, cf. H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia*, xii (1943), 300 ; *G.T.P.* (= *Greek Theatre Production*), pp. 43 ff.

[3] The old Dionysos temple : Pickard-Cambridge, *Theatre of Dionysos* (= *P.C.T.*), p. 3. Cf. also my *Greek Art and Literature, 730-330 B.C.*, pp. 58 f.

date of 560/40 B.C., is given by the limestone pediment of which a fragment was found near the temple.[1] It represents a maenad between two satyrs, who are playing the flute, and the figures closely approximate to the satyrs and maenads on black-figure vases by Lydos and the Amasis painter. Presumably the god himself occupied the centre of the pediment. Whether the subject was Dionysos with satyrs and maenads or Dionysos and the Return of Hephaistos we cannot say. Nor can we be certain whether the pediment belongs to the temple of which the foundations remain or to a yet earlier temple. But we know that ten to twenty years before the introduction of tragedy the temple of the god was adorned with a representation of the god accompanied by satyrs and maenads.

2. (*a*) In the theatre itself the oldest remains are three short pieces of wall of the same construction as the old temple ;[2] all are within the later stage-building, and they are numbered from East to West SM 1, J 3, SM 3. All are situated higher than the foundations and bottom course of the old temple, SM 1 by 86 cm., J 3 by 1.35 m., SM 3 by 37 cm. There is general agreement that SM 3 belongs to a way up from the temple to the *orchestra*, but SM 1 has been attributed both to the boundary of the *orchestra* itself and to the terrace wall supporting the *orchestra*. These portions of wall must be pre-Persian, but more we cannot say.

2. (*b*) In the auditorium clear signs were found that the hill was hollowed out in the very early fifth century.[3] It is perfectly possible that this forming of the auditorium coincided with the making of the orchestra represented by SM 1, J 3, and SM 3.

3. The earliest surviving trace of stage buildings is the rectangular foundation T, which projects forward from a long wall H carrying slots for wooden timbers. This wall is itself backed by the back wall of the Stoa below it, which was evidently part of the same reconstruction plan.[4] Breccia was used for

[1] Athens, National Museum 3131. Studniczka, *A.M.* xi (1886), 78, Pl. 2 ; Frickenhaus, *J.d.I.* xxxii (1917), 2, Fig. 1 ; Brommer, *Satyroi*, p. 27 ; Bieber, *History of the Greek Theater* (= *H.T.*), p. 99, Fig. 144 ; *P.C.T.* p. 4.

[2] *P.C.T.* pp. 5 ff. ; Fiechter, *Das Dionysostheater in Athen*, i 39 f. ; iii. 48, 66 f. ; Dinsmoor, *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, i. 309 f.

[3] *P.C.T.* p. 14 ; Dörpfeld-Reisch, *Das griechische Theater*, pp. 30-1.

[4] *P.C.T.* p. 16, 21 ; Bulle, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 54, 64 ; Dinsmoor, p. 317.

these foundations, and breccia was not used much before 430 B.C. in Athenian architecture. On the other hand this reconstruction cannot have been much later since the pottery found under T and the wall was all of the fifth century or earlier. The highest course of T is 95 cm. above J 3. Therefore the building of T and its wall H effectively obliterated any earlier stage-buildings. T and its wall H may be called for simplicity the Periclean theatre.

4. The Lycurgan stage building, which was built about 330 B.C., had a new marble façade with projecting wings some 5 m. in front of T. The length of the façade between the wings was 20 m.

The certain dates then are (1) pediment of old Dionysos temple (whether in its original form or not) 560/40, (2(*a*)) earliest surviving orchestra before 480, (2(*b*)) forming of the auditorium soon after 500 B.C., (3) earliest surviving stage buildings with stone foundations about 430 B.C., (4) Lycurgan theatre 330 B.C.

The first question is whether the earliest surviving orchestra belongs to the sixth century Dionysos temple or to the early fifty-century auditorium. Or to put it in another way, is it the theatre of Thespis or the theatre of Aeschylus? If the remains do not answer this problem, we can at least consider other arguments. The strongest seems to me the complete disassociation of the old temple from this orchestra. If they were built at the same time, why was the temple not placed on the same level and facing on to the orchestra? If, however, the orchestra was constructed half a century later in response to a crisis, then the disassociation becomes intelligible.

The crisis which caused the forming or remodelling of the auditorium in the early fifth century is generally believed to be the collapse of the *ikria*, the wooden stands on which the audience had hitherto sat.[1] The notices about the *ikria* are both late and confusing, and the word itself can be used both for the stands (which collapsed) and for wooden seats in the later auditorium. The Suda lexikon gives under Pratinas: "he competed with Aeschylus and Choerilus in 499-496 B.C. . . . when he was giving a performance, the *ikria* on which the spectators were standing collapsed and after this the auditorium (*theatron*) was

[1] *P.C.T.* pp. 11 ff.

built at Athens ", and under Aeschylus : " he went into exile in Sicily because the *ikria* collapsed when he was giving a performance." Aeschylus went to Sicily between 472 and 467 and again after 458 ; Pratinas died shortly before 467 ; therefore the collapse of the *ikria* must have been before Aeschylus' first visit. The story of his exile is nonsense ; some scholar has converted, as often, a chronological sequence into a causal connection. The names of Aeschylus and Pratinas, who wrote tragedies and satyr plays, tie these *ikria* to the City Dionysia and the precinct of Dionysos Eleuthereus.

These are the only references to the collapse of the *ikria*. Another group speaks of " seeing from the poplar tree ". According to Hesychios " the poplar tree was near the temple where before the auditorium (*theatron*) was made they fixed the *ikria* ". If the temple was the old temple of Dionysos (which is the natural interpretation), we have here precious evidence that before the building of the auditorium the *ikria* were put up near the old temple. This then was the theatre of Thespis, and it lasted until the *ikria* collapsed in the days of Pratinas and Aeschylus ; then the new auditorium and the new *orchestra*, our earliest surviving *orchestra*, was built.

But we are told that " various passages speak of a single poplar tree (*aigeiros*) in the *agora* which must surely be identical with the *aigeiros* close to the *ikria* ".[1] Reference to the various passages shows that only two refer to the Agora : neither of these mention *ikria* ; one of them (Andocides, 1, 133) refers to a white poplar (*leuke*), *not* to a black poplar (*aigeiros*) ; the other in its early form refers to *aigeiroi* in the plural *not* in the singular. Knowing, therefore, that Aeschylus and Pratinas performed at the City Dionysia, we can firmly separate the single black poplar near the temple of Dionysos from the group of black poplars in the Agora.

I do not, of course, deny that there were early dramatic performances in the Agora or that their audiences sat on *ikria*. But the *ikria* did not collapse and the performances had nothing to do with the City Dionysia : there is a tenuous connection with the Lenaion and the Lenaia, and the dramatic performances at the Lenaia were transferred to the theatre of Dionysos about the

[1] *P.C.T.* p. 12 ; cf. Wycherley, *Athenian Agora*, III, *Testimonia*, nos. 722 ff.

middle of the fifth century.[1] The notices are quite consistent with this interpretation : according to Photius " the *ikria* were the seats in the *agora* from which they saw the Dionysiac contests before the theatre in the precinct of Dionysos was built " ; " the *orchestra* was a name used in the *agora* first and later for the lower semi-circle of the theatre. There the choruses sang and danced." Thus the evidence is good for *ikria* and *orchestra* in the Agora, and the *orchestra* was near the statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton.[2] By the time of Socrates' *Apology* in 399 B.C. it had become the book-market, which agrees perfectly with the transference of the dramatic performances to the theatre in the middle of the fifth century. The further problem is the identification of the Dionysiac contests in the Agora with the performances at the Lenaia festival. The Lenaian festival was held at the Lenaion " a shrine of Dionysos, where they had contests before the theatre was built ". This is the familiar phrasing, but the connection with the Agora is tenuous : the Lenaion is said to be near the *Kalamites heros* ; Aischines' mother held her rites in the shed near the *Kalamites heros* ; on this passage of Demosthenes one ancient commentator remarks : " shed. The building with big doors in the Agora." This is the only evidence for putting the Lenaion in the Agora. On the other hand what were the Dionysiac contests in the Agora if they were not the contests at the Lenaia which we know were later transferred to the theatre ? It is therefore tempting to suppose that the *orchestra* in the Agora was in the enclosure of the Lenaion. For the history of Greek staging this tells us very little. The performances in the Agora took place on a dancing floor (*orchestra*) and the audience sat on benches. The performances at the Lenaia (whether identified with the performances in the Agora or not) took place in a large precinct which included the shrine of Dionysos. It must also have had *ikria* and an *orchestra*.

Similarly the theatre of Thespis had *ikria* near the old temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus and, we must assume, a dancing floor (*orchestra*). We cannot say how much levelling had to be done

[1] Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals* (= *P.C.F.*), p. 38, and p. 25, nos. 22-7 ; cf. also Wycherley, *Testimonia*, nos. 524-8.

[2] Quoted by Wycherley, no. 276.

to make the dancing floor, but if the stories about the collapse of the *ikria* are true we must suppose that the hill was only used to support some of the seats. If, as seems natural, the *orchestra* was in front of the temple, the *ikria* on the southern side must have been stands and it was presumably these that collapsed. If this is accepted, one further and very important point follows. The theatre of Thespis had from the beginning the front of the temple of Dionysos as a background. Thespis and his successors down to and including Aeschylus in his early period acted in front of its columns and under its pediment. Thus a doorway with columns and pediment is from the beginning the natural background of Greek tragedy.[1] It may not be chance that the assumed width of this background is very close to the preserved width of T, the projecting foundation of the Periclean stage building.

When the *ikria* collapsed, the decision was taken to use the steepened hillside as a foundation for the seats and to have an *orchestra* well above the temple supported by a retaining wall. The temple thus fell out of the picture, and the audience would see little but its roof below and to the right of the *orchestra*. As a background it must have been replaced by a building of wood or stone all traces of which have been obliterated by the Periclean rebuilding. The chief reason for assuming such a building is the evidence of the plays themselves.[2] This is the theatre in which all the surviving plays of Aeschylus, the *Ajax* and *Antigone* of Sophocles, the *Alcestis* of Euripides were produced, even if we exclude the *Trachiniae*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Medea*, and *Hippolytus* as being possibly among the earliest productions in the Periclean theatre. When every allowance is made for the dramatist's skill in substituting verbal description for visual communication, the evidence of the plays establishes (1) that communication between the actors and the chorus was easy, (2) that a single practicable door faced the audience, (3) that a high platform existed, (4) that

[1] The theatre at Thorikos in Attica has no visible remains of a background (cf. Dilke, *B.S.A.* xlv (1950), 25), but this does not exclude a temporary background. The arrangement assumed is found in the Cabeiran theatre.

[2] Cf. *G.T.P.* pp. 7 ff. On the *ekkyklema* see now A. M. Dale, *W.S.* lxix (1956), 98. South Italian vase, New York 16. 140, *G.T.P.* no. A 26.

a scene inside the building could be represented by a platform (*ekkyklema*) which was rolled out through the doors. We need not assume scene-painting if, as I have argued, Agatharchus is better dated to the time of the Periclean theatre and painted scenery for a reproduction of Aeschylus. Nor perhaps is the crane (*geranos* or *mechane*) a necessary assumption for Aeschylus. It is true that Pollux's example of the use of the *geranos* is drawn from Aeschylus' *Psychostasia*, but the *geranos* may have been used in a later reproduction like that of the *Europa* figured on a South Italian vase of the early fourth century. The crane was certainly used in the Periclean theatre. A temple-like wooden building with a usable roof and a practicable door through which the *ekkyklema* could be rolled is all that we need assume for the pre-Periclean theatre. We know that the retaining wall was curved and therefore this stage building, which stood between the *orchestra* circle and the retaining wall, is unlikely to have had any great lateral extension like the wall H behind T in the Periclean theatre. And because the stage-building stood between the retaining wall and the *orchestra* circle, it seems to me necessary to accept Fiechter's reconstruction with J 3 as the *orchestra* and SM 1 as the retaining wall rather than Dörpfeld's larger *orchestra* circle which includes J 3 and SM 1 and coincides on the south with the retaining wall.[1]

Of the contemporary vases which illustrate Aeschylean and Sophoclean tragedy only one shows indirectly something of stage production. Sir John Beazley [2] has published fragments of an Attic hydria painted between 480 and 450, which shows a chorus of Persians evincing astonishment as a king rises above a lighted pyre. The fluteplayer in long robes and the chorus point to tragedy and specifically to Aeschylus' *Persians*. But no one would build a pyre on the stage and light it for a single play in the long day's contest. The burning pyre therefore must be the painter's imagination, his way of saying that the king was well and truly buried. Why he chose this way of saying it we cannot tell. Or did the producer perhaps use a pyre-like structure as a shorthand for a tomb and was this rolled out on the *ekkyklema*?

[1] Cf. Schleif, *A.A.* lii (1937), 26 f.; Dinsmoor, p. 312.
[2] Corinth T 1144, *Hesperia*, xxiv (1955), 305, Pl. 45.

A raised structure on the front of the *ekkyklema* is the obvious way of introducing Dareius' tomb and the only way of making his rising above it convincing. A fragment of approximately the same date in Boston [1] shows an armed hero rising above his tomb mound (Achilles demanding the sacrifice of Polyxena?) but unfortunately there is nothing to connect it with tragedy.

To the Periclean stage-building belong the foundation T (7.53 m. wide, 3.26 m. deep) and the slotted wall H (28 m. long) behind it. In this theatre provision was undoubtedly made for the crane and for scenery.[2] All that we can say about the crane is that two holes at the back of T, the Western one measuring 70 × 70 cm. and the Eastern one 1·25 m. × 70 cm., may have held the mast of the crane and the winch which worked it; the jib of the crane must have been attached to the mast above the roof of the stage building since the actor could be raised from the interior of the stage building, swung over, and landed on the stage and vice versa. The scenery which Agatharchos painted was affixed to the stage-building when required. But what shape was the stage-building and what was the real function of T?

Pickard-Cambridge's plan shows a flight of steps leading down from T through the wall H into the long Stoa behind and in front of T a wooden façade with wings touching the *orchestra* circle. Essentially the same plan with more elaborate wings is given later by Dinsmoor and with the front moved back level with T in Fiechter's earlier "classical theatre".[3] There is no evidence either for the staircase or for the façade. Fiechter noted a tooling of the stone of the wall of the Stoa where it runs along the back of T and took this to be the threshold of a doorway which was 0.79 m. above the floor of the Stoa. Schleif [4] accepted this as a doorway but saw that a further rise of 1·38 m. was needed to reach the level of the *orchestra*; he therefore assumes a further set of

[1] Museum of Fine Arts, 13. 169. Beazley, *A.R.V.*, p. 188, no. 59.

[2] Cf. *G.T.P.* pp. 12 ff. for instances. Medea, Bellerophon, Perseus, and Apollo in the *Orestes* are certain. I am now inclined to add the plays where a supernatural appearance over the roof is announced by chorus or actor: Thetis in *Andromache*, Iris and Lyssa in *Hercules Furens*, Athena in *Ion*, Dioscuri in *Electra*, and the Muse in the post-Euripidean *Rhesus*.

[3] *P.C.T.* p. 16, Fig. 7; Dinsmoor, pp. 326 f. Fiechter, iii, Pl. 18.

[4] Schleif, pp. 30 f.

seven steps into T from the doorway. In fact we can probably assume that a further three steps would be needed since the door on to the stage (which is in any reconstruction the Northern end of T or T's extension) is above the *orchestra*. Thus Schleif's staircase would take up about two-thirds of the depth of T and make T almost useless for anything else. Pickard-Cambridge's plan conceals the awkward fact that the alleged threshold is not symmetrical with T but starts well over to the East side and ends shortly past the middle of T, and Schleif 's staircase only uses the Western half of the threshold so as not to foul the big Eastern hole in T. In fact the threshold is not a threshold at all ; the stones have been tooled to take some large object, picture, relief, or inscription, on the back wall of the Stoa and have nothing to do with T. T was backed by the unpierced Stoa wall.

Seen from the audience T (or rather its superstructure) occupies the position of the old temple in the theatre of Thespis and the assumed scene building of the Aeschylean theatre. In Attic and South Italian art [1] of the late fifth and first half of the fourth century a doorway between columns and under a pediment is shorthand for the theatre ; and this must have been a main feature of T's superstructure, so that it looked not so very unlike the old temple. The doors had to open, and the depth available for their opening is limited by the arrangements for the *mechane* to a maximum of 2·30 m. Thus a 4·60 m. opening is an absolute maximum, if the doorposts were as near the front as possible. But there is another limiting factor. For the Periclean theatre the *ekkyklema* [2] is not merely assumed but is attested by Aristophanes. By definition the *ekkyklema* shows the inside of the palace, house, or temple *outside* the front door. The doors must therefore be set far enough back on T for the *ekkyklema* to appear in front of them. The total available depth of T is 2·30 m., as we have said, and perhaps 1 m. may be regarded as a minimum distance for the *ekkyklema* to project beyond the door when it is rolled out. If we take this figure, then the available depth behind the door posts is 1·30 m., which gives a maximum opening of

[1] Cf. below, p. 505, n. 3 ; p. 506, n. 3, 4.

[2] Cf. A. M. Dale, *W.S.* lxix (1956), 98 on *Ach.* 408, *Thesm.* 96.

2·60 m. and a maximum width for the *ekkyklema* of about 2·55 m.[1] The available depth behind the doorposts is also the maximum depth for the *ekkyklema*, since, when the *ekkyklema* is not in use, its front must be flush with the doorpost and in fact appears as the threshold of the doors. Thus starting from the possibilities of T we arrive at $2{\cdot}55 \times 1{\cdot}30$ as the maximum size for the *ekkyklema*; starting from the other end, the requirements of the plays, I think we can see that a platform 2·55 m. wide by 1·3 m. deep would provide enough room for the required tableaux, for Euripides and his properties in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* and for Herakles, the bodies of his wife and children, and the broken column in Euripides' *Hercules*.[2]

Together the arrangements for the *mechane* and the *ekkyklema* would occupy the whole of T behind the doors. T, as we have seen, had no access from the back; but it must have been possible for an actor who had entered the palace to change his clothes and come on through the *parodoi* in another part, and it must have been possible to reach the roof.[3] Changing rooms, access to the *parodoi*, and access to the roof must therefore have been contained in the wooden building erected on the slotted wall H which stretches on either side of T, and this building must also have had openings leading on to T.[4] Our only direct evidence for this building is the wall H, which is 28 m. long with slots at 2·56 m. intervals, five on each side of T. The door posts on T according to our assumption stand 2·26 m. in front of the slotted wall. Presumably the front wall of the lateral building was not in front of the door posts on T; therefore its maximum depth cannot have been more than 2·26 m. The only building which affords

[1] Width of doorways vary greatly: e.g. Oropos 1 m., Priene 1·6 m., Sikyon 2·5 m.; Syracuse and Pergamon total width between wooden supports, 3·5 and 3·7 m. respectively.

[2] *G.T.P.* p. 9; Euripides, *H.F.* 1081 ff.

[3] E.g. Antigone and the old man in the *Phoenissae*; gods when they do not use the crane; Bdelykleon at the beginning of the *Wasps*.

[4] Demosthenes, *Meidias*, 17, and his commentators (quoted *P.C.T.* p. 24) are perfectly consistent with this. His chorus wanted to change in the changing rooms and enter the *orchestra* (whether through the central doors or through the exits giving on to the *parodoi*). Meidias nailed up the *paraskenia*, the lateral extensions of the *skene* proper, which was the superstructure of T.

any sort of parallel is the stage building of the theatre in Corinth.[1] This stage building also belonged to the very late fifth century and was built of wood. It was 21 m. long and 4 m. deep, and front and back had eight slots for wooden posts set at 3 m. intervals. The remains at Corinth give no indication of height. We have perhaps a pointer in Xenophon.[2] He is discussing the ox teams used by Cyrus to move his fortresses on wheels. These fortresses were " 3 fathoms high with their wheels " and " their beams had the thickness (of the beams) of the tragic *skene* ". If Xenophon is thinking of the upright beams (or columns) of H and T, then they may have had a height of about 5 m., which is the height assumed by Fiechter for the columns of the old temple. It is also the length of the beam provided for the *logeion* in the theatre at Delos. The other theatres of which we know the height are much later and the Hellenistic *proskenion* beneath the stage may well have been lower. But the height of the fourth century (?) *skene* at Epidaurus is probably given by the gateways to the *parodoi* and this was 3·53 m. for a *skene* 19·50 m. long ; 5 m. does not therefore seem unreasonable for the Athenian *skene* which was 28 m. long.

The Corinth building certainly had no projecting wings, and at Athens the projecting wings which appear on the reconstructions are a pure assumption, an assumption which has become less likely since the publication of the Corinthian parallel. The

[1] Corinth : R. Stilwell, *Corinth*, ii. 15 ff. I suspect that the building was originally 21 m. long and 4 m. deep, set symmetrically with the *orchestra*. Of other wooden buildings of which traces survive Syracuse is too doubtful to use and it is quite unclear to what date the 3·5 m. openings should be referred ; Pergamon presumably from the beginning had the shape of a late Hellenistic stage-building. The slots for the beams in H were from 0·40 to 0·49 m. wide and from 0·35 to 0·46 m. deep ; Fiechter, i. 15, compared the 0·40 m. slots in Pergamon ; the sockets for the front row of beams in Corinth were 0·20 × 0·30 m. and for the back row 0·50 × 0·60 m.

[2] *Cyropedia*, vi. 1, 52-4. Fiechter, iii. 66. Beam for the *logeion* in Delos : Vallois, *Architecture Hellénique à Délos*, p. 237 ; this may be a horizontal rather than a vertical beam, cf. *G.T.P.* p. 147. The cross beams of the naval arsenal at the Peiraeus were 0·75 × 0·75 × 6 m. (Robertson, *Greek and Roman Architecture*, p. 182). Ptolemy's Banqueting Tent had two wooden columns 22·5 m. high. Preserved heights of *proskenion* in Hellenistic theatres : Oropos, 2·68 m. (length 12·30 m.) ; Priene, 2·723 m. (length 21 m.) ; Sikyon, 3·10 m. (length 23·75 m.).

main functions of the building were to house changing rooms, to provide communications for actors between the palace entrance, the outside entrances (*parodoi*), and, when necessary, the roof, and lastly to provide a framework for the display of scenery. Dinsmoor [1] assumes, as I do, a line of wooden vertical beams parallel to and in front of the slots but then adds at each end further vertical beams in front of them to provide the wings. Such projecting wings would of course have no reflection in the existent slots of the back wall and cannot be refuted on these grounds. The arguments against them are first the analogy with the wooden building at Corinth, secondly the use of the central doorway by itself as a shorthand for the theatre in vase-painting, and thirdly the demands of the plays themselves. The plays demand communication between the *orchestra* and the *parodoi* and the door of the stage-building but nowhere suggest the desirability of a long narrow area framed by wings. Neither tragedy nor comedy gives evidence for more than one door in the stage-building itself [2] (and the existence of such doors would spread the action along the back wall and thereby make the framing by projecting wings desirable), and there is no reason to suppose that in fundamentals the theatre of Euripides and Aristophanes looked any different from the theatre of Aeschylus and the theatre of Thespis : the fundamentals are a circular dancing floor dominated by a temple (or palace).

In the Periclean theatre (according to the reconstruction proposed above) the central doorway was 2·60 m. wide and gave on to a platform 7·53 m. wide and 1 m. deep. This area was the stage in the modern sense, the normal location for the actors (although at times they remained on the *orchestra* level), and was connected with the *orchestra* by a short flight of steps, which were usually in the centre but could be placed at the sides when the *ekkyklema* was pushed forward for the whole play, as in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* ; there is good evidence for such steps in vase-paintings of comedy, both Attic and South Italian.[3] On either

[1] Pp. 326 f.

[2] On tragedy cf. *G.T.P.* p. 10. On comedy I accept the conclusions of A. M. Dale, *J.H.S.* lxxvii (1957), 207.

[3] On the *Philoctetes* cf. A. M. Dale, *W.S.* lxix (1956), 104. Steps in comic scenes on vases : e.g. *G.T.P.* no. B 1 (Attic), 32, 43 (S. Italian), 67 (Sicilian).

side of the central door was a panel roughly 2·30 m. wide which connected the central door with the lateral building H stretching out beyond T, masked the access to the roof and wings, could carry scenery and when necessary contain a window.[1] It is probable that these panels continued the line of the front wall of the lateral building but whether this whole front line was level with the central door or was set slightly back I see no means of determining, but it seems to me more likely that the central door was set a little forward and that this emphasized both its own importance and its connection with the *orchestra*. If the door columns were thus set forward, the junction with the lateral panels would be masked by columns and the four columns would give rise to the stylization as an *aedicula* which is commonly used on South Italian vases.[2]

We have no direct evidence as to whether the columns were of wood like the rest of the stage building or of stone. It is probable that the breccia foundation carried a stone floor but this does not necessarily mean that the columns and entablature were of stone. The analogy of South Italian theatre buildings suggests wood and on the Attic Iphigeneia vase [3] the building is certainly wooden although Euripides imagines an elaborate temple with high walls, triglyphs, gilded cornice, pillars, bronze doors, and marble base for the statue, like any fifth-century marble temple. On the Iphigeneia vase the temple is poised on two high steps and the painter may have been thinking of the high threshold formed by the *ekkyklema* when it was pushed back and of the stage in front of the door. On the South Italian vases [4]

[1] On windows in *Wasps*, *Ecclesiazusae*, *Clouds* cf. A. M. Dale, *J.H.S.*, lxxvii (1957), 205, 208, 210. Windows on South Italian vases: *G.T.P.*, no. B 32, 37, 60.

[2] Yet another possibility is that doors and side panels were in line and that this whole front on T was set forward of the line of the front wall of H and was topped by a single pediment. This would preserve the proportions of the Old Temple but would not agree either with the Attic Iphigeneia vase (see p. 505, n. 3) or with the South Italian vases which show either a pedimented doorway or an *aedicula* (see p. 505, n. 4; p. 506, n. 3, 4).

[3] *G.T.P.* no. A 8.

[4] pediment: *G.T.P.* nos. A 26, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44; B 32, 33, 43. threshold: *G.T.P.* nos. A 26, 36, 39; B 34, 37, 61. double step: *G.T.P.* nos. A 36, 42, 43; B 41.

which have scenes inspired by tragedy or actual representations of comedy, the pediment is often shown, the threshold is sometimes shown, and occasionally in the tragic scenes a double step is shown as on the Iphigeneia vase. Where the comic scenes seem to show a plain door without a pediment,[1] this may be illusory as in every case the top of the door coincides with the top of the vase. Three vases deserve special mention here. An Apulian vase [2] of the early fourth century shows a comic scene in which an old man is welcomed by an old woman ; the setting is exactly what I have assumed for the Periclean theatre—to the left of the old man a column, which could cover the junction between the lateral building and T, and to the right of the old woman double doors surmounted by a pediment. A rather later Apulian vase [3] gives a version of the letter scene from the *Iphigeneia in Tauris* in which the *aedicula* stands on two steps but the lower step is extended to support the altar : in our terms the altar is on the stage at the side of the central door. An Apulian vase [4] of 330/20 B.C. shows Niobe standing in an *aedicula* with a high decorated base, which represents the tomb of Niobe's children. If the *aedicula* represents the central door then the high decorated base is inspired by the *ekkyklema* : in the original production of Aeschylus the tomb of Niobe's children was probably represented on the *ekkyklema* like the tomb of Dareios in the *Persae*.

In the Periclean theatre the fundamentals are a circular dancing floor dominated by a single door with a stage in front of it. The last play for which we can say this arrangement was necessary is Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* which was produced in 391 B.C. There the whole effect of the scene between the girl, the hag, and the young man depends on the two women having separate windows and a common front door.[5] The *Dyskolos* by Menander is our first and only complete text of a play written for the theatre of Lycurgus. It was produced in 316 B.C. when the

[1] *G.T.P.* nos. B 34, 37, 61.

[2] Harvard University, McDaniell Collection, *Hirsch Sale Catalogue*, no. 30, Pl. 16. See now A. D. Trendall, Phlyax Vases, *B.I.C.S.*, Supplt. 8, no. 23.

[3] Apulian vase, Moscow, *P.C.T.* Fig. 16.

[4] *G.T.P.* no. A 44.

[5] Cf. A. M. Dale, *J.H.S.* lxxvii (1957), 208.

new theatre was about fourteen years old. The setting is made clear in the prologue which is spoken by the god Pan: "The shrine of the Nymphs from which I make my entry belongs to the people of Phylae . . . Knemon (the hero) occupies the land on the right . . . a little estate nearby here belongs to" Gorgias, who is Knemon's stepson. The set therefore must represent a central shrine of the Nymphs with Knemon's house on the left (for the audience) and Gorgias' house on the right. The audience sees an elaborate central door (the shrine here, the palace or temple in tragedy), and a simpler door at each side (the two houses in comedy). Behind this façade an actor could pass swiftly between the three doors and the *parodoi*.

Those needs are made particularly clear by the first act. Let us call the three actors A, B, C. A speaks the prologue as Pan; he makes his entrance and his exit through the Nymphaion (central door). He goes off when he sees the young lover Sostratos (B) and his parasite Chaireas (C) appearing up the right *parodos*. After 30 lines they are joined by the slave Pyrrhias who enters up the left *parodos*; actor A has therefore changed his mask and clothes and reappears up the left *parodos* as Pyrrhias. After another 60 lines Chaireas (C) goes off by the right *parodos*, changes mask and clothes, and reappears up the left *parodos* as Knemon. As he appears, Pyrrhias (A) retires into the Nymphaion; later Knemon (C) goes into his house on the left, leaving Sostratos (B) on the stage. Actor A comes out of Knemon's house as Knemon's daughter, having changed his mask and clothes. The daughter wants to fetch water from the Nymphaion, and Sostratos goes to get it for her. She goes back into her father's house (left). As Sostratos takes her the water, actor C, who has changed mask and clothes and crossed over, comes out of Gorgias' house (right) as Daos, Gorgias' slave, and comments on the proceedings. After his last words from Knemon's door as Knemon's daughter, actor A does an extremely quick change and reappears as Pyrrhias from the Nymphaion.

The remains of the theatre of Lycurgus show the foundations of a front wall with projecting wings and an open hall behind. It is always assumed that the front wall was pierced by three doors of which the central and more elaborate door was used for

tragedy; comedy could use all three doors when necessary or only the two side doors when two houses were all that was needed.[1] The *Dyskolos* shows the rightness of this assumption. All three doors are needed, and the actors have to be able to change masks and clothes and pass from door to door or into the *parodoi* in the minimum of time. The projecting wings perform the double function of framing the long stage and of covering a short cut from the hall behind the façade to the *parodoi*. This complete change in the character of the theatre corresponds to two essential changes in the nature of comedy. The first is that comedy now requires a realistic scene with *either* two houses *or* two houses with a third building between them. In our scene Knemon's house, the Nymphaion, and Gorgias' house must have their separate doors: Daos must be able to enter from Gorgias' house and watch Sostratos come out of the Nymphaion, walk across to Knemon's house and give the girl her pot of water as she stands in the doorway. Later the old woman Simike must be able to enter from Knemon's house to announce that he has fallen down the well at the same moment as the cook Sikon enters from the Nymphaion to ask for silence for the sacrifice.

The other change is the exclusion of the chorus. In the *Dyskolos* the chorus enter after the first act and Daos says: "I had better get out of the way; some drunks are coming." The manuscripts then note XOPOY, and we assume that the interval between the acts was marked by a song which was not specially composed for the play. There is no reason to suppose that the chorus remained in the *orchestra* during the action of the play; they may only have come on for the intervals. Daos' preliminary remark is the only link between actors and chorus. Dialogue sung or spoken between actors and chorus and commentary by the chorus leader on the action have alike vanished. In Old Comedy and classical tragedy the action on the stage was watched

[1] Only the foundations of the front wall of the Lycurgan stage-building exist; so no trace of doors remains. No other surviving theatre helps. Dörpfeld (in Dörpfeld-Reisch, p. 124) attributes the three doors at Epidaurus to the later Hellenistic rebuilding. The first stage-building of Eretria (which to judge from its masonry is not earlier than the fourth century) gives no evidence for three doors: the openings which remain belong to three rooms at the back of the stage buildings.

by the chorus and annotated by its leader, and this relationship was expressed in the design of the Periclean theatre. Now the action takes place on a long, framed stage and the *orchestra* is empty. Some idea of the appearance of the Lycurgan stage-building is given by a South Italian terracotta [1] of the late fourth or very early third century B.C.; it evidently represents a South Italian theatre remodelled on the lines of the Lycurgan theatre. It is only a logical step further to remove the action to the roof and give the picture frame a bottom as well as sides and top; and this step was taken in the second century.

The theatre of Lycurgus had been in existence about ten years when Menander started to write. He was therefore exploiting existing conditions. The new design of the theatre of Lycurgus must have met an existing demand and, of course, we do not know that it did not have a forerunner in wood. There is perhaps a slight indication of this on a Lucanian aryballos [2] of 340/30 B.C., on which the mask of Electra is posed above a long stage supported by crossbeams. This stage is quite unlike the stages on the rather earlier comic vases which are supported on columns and approached by flights of steps: it might, however, very well be the long low stage of a three-door theatre with wings. If my conjecture [3] that the *Menaechmi* of Plautus is an adaptation of Alexis' *Adelphoi*, which was produced about 340 B.C., is right, then plays which demanded two doors were being written about 340; confusion of characters in such plays is quite sufficient without confusion of localities as well. In general it seems to me likely that the demand grew with the comedies of intrigue, which were already being produced before the middle of the fourth century, and that it may have been first met by the provision of side doors in the lateral building H of the Periclean theatre. But this is conjecture, and we only reach comparative certainty with the theatre of Lycurgus and Menander's *Dyskolos*.

[1] *G.T.P.* no. A 49.
[2] *British Museum Quarterly*, 29 (1959), p. 100.
[3] Cf. *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, p. 72.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
ABERDEEN